

PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. H. Lea to be postmaster at Carnegie, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel R. McMorran to be postmaster at Aspinwall, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Herman H. North to be postmaster at Bradford, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania.

TEXAS.

Isham H. Nelson to be postmaster at Snyder, in the county of Scurry and State of Texas.

Laura M. Poe to be postmaster at Santa Anna, in the county of Coleman and State of Texas.

Jacob J. Utts to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Van Zandt and State of Texas.

Wilber H. Webber to be postmaster at Lampasas, in the county of Lampasas and State of Texas.

David M. Wilson to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Wise and State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 28, 1907.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXPLANATION.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain a statement I made on the day of the last session of the House. On page 1784 of the RECORD of January 26, during the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill, after the paragraph in relation to breeding animals was stricken out on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] offered an amendment restoring that part of the paragraph relating to the appropriation to aid the State experimental station in carrying on this work, but leaving the amount to be appropriated at \$50,000, as originally carried in the bill. To that I offered an amendment reducing the amount carried in the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado from \$50,000 to \$25,000. In explanation of my amendment I made the statement "and I am informed that it was understood among the members of the committee that if the proviso went out the amount should be reduced to \$25,000, which is the current appropriation." The basis for that statement was remarks that were made here about me on the floor at that time concerning the matter; but I have since been informed by the chairman of the committee having in charge the agricultural appropriation bill that there was no agreement; there was no understanding whatever relative to the amount that was to be carried by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] in the event that the proviso went out, as stated by me, and that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brooks] in offering the amendment as he did did not do so in violation of any agreement or any understanding whatever. I wish to exonerate him entirely from the implication in my remarks. The statement I made was incorrect and not justified by the fact. I make this statement in justice to the gentleman from Colorado.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the RECORD to be corrected?

Mr. TAWNEY. I just want to make that statement in explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota for his very kind action in making the correction, and also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] for his statement to the same effect.

POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution:

The Clerk read as follows (H. J. Res. 230):

Resolved, That the Joint Commission of Congress appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, approved June 26, 1906, shall not be deemed to be discharged by the presentation to the Senate or the House of Representatives of its said report, but is hereby continued in existence with all the powers created by said act until the termination of the present session of Congress for the purpose of completing the preparation, printing, and publication of the record of the hearings held by said Commission, and for the preparation, printing, and publication of an index and digest of the same. And the unexpended balance of the appropriation for said Commission in said act shall be available for the expenses of the said Commission. And that payments that have been made or are hereafter to be made on account of the expenses of the said Commission, upon vouchers approved by the chairman thereof, shall be deemed held and taken and

are hereby declared to be conclusive upon all Departments and officers of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield to me? Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think this resolution ought to pass the House. That Commission has not finished its work, not because of any fault of its own, but because they have not had time. It appears to me to be a matter of very great importance in the economical administration of the Department; and I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

REPORT OF POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana presented the report of the Postal Commission authorized by Congress to make inquiry regarding second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

- S. 5380. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6044. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4629. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6634. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7021. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. McJunkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5171. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie H. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2748. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7078. An act granting a pension to Daniel Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7218. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2954. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7491. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna V. Blaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5970. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7492. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Clow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3563. An act granting an increase of pension to Orin D. Sisco—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7452. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6956. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Ford, alias Jacob Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6711. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey B. F. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 6713. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7683. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wakefield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5400. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7509. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4958. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Duffield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 5782. An act granting an increase of pension to Octave L. F. E. Fariola—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4396. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 3434. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Canfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7379. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 7025. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. West—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 7672. An act granting an increase of pension to Elvina Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 5261. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7673. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Jordan—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7668. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Buzzell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7666. An act granting an increase of pension to True Sanborn, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7430. An act granting a pension to Mary F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7818. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1261. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7745. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7574. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Larkham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7843. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Oakman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6734. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Snell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7685. An act granting an increase of pension to Albion W. Tebbetts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7380. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7058. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Baillie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7533. An act granting an increase of pension to Orvil Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4742. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Allen—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7061. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh McNaughton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5681. An act granting an increase of pension to William Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7171. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Holden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5884. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7136. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornelia W. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7272. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7196. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4693. An act granting an increase of pension to Irvin M. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7820. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin B. Cravens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7642. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. P. Rhoads—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3268. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6612. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. McClung—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4873. An act granting an increase of pension to D. Laning Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6606. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander Sholl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5374. An act granting a pension to Floyd A. Honaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6909. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7044. An act granting an increase of pension to Sylvester O. Pevear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6665. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. T. Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 177. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvah D. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7394. An act granting an increase of pension to Henrietta C. Cooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2083. An act granting an increase of pension to Asa K. Harbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7150. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6899. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Nye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7880. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stockton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5457. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Teets—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3998. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1622. An act granting a pension to Jane Agnew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3127. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Callender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7605. An act granting an increase of pension to Judiah B. Smithson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6352. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram H. Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7841. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank De Noyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5730. An act granting an increase of pension to William O. Spelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7355. An act granting an increase of pension to William McHenry Plotner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6635. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7840. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Towne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7768. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo P. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7684. An act to provide and maintain for the port of Galveston, Tex., a customs boarding boat—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 7706. An act for the relief of Robert Broadbent, Barger Holst, James A. Dunham, Byron Dawley, Axel Rosendahl, Will J. Elliott, and C. M. Hutchins—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4559. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3645. An act to correct the military record of Edwin Moyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1566. An act for the relief of Isaiah Heylin McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7996. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7995. An act granting an increase of pension to Ashley White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7879. An act granting to the Los Angeles Inter-Urban Railway Company a right of way for railroad purposes through the United States military reservation at San Pedro, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7840. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Towne.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 24111. An act to authorize the Norfolk and Western Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Potomac River, at or near Shepherdstown, W. Va.;

H. R. 21402. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Gregg Shoals;

H. R. 24047. An act to authorize Chapter No. 376 of the Daughters of the American Revolution to erect a fountain on the property of the United States at Paducah, Ky.; and

H. R. 24104. An act transferring Phelps County to the eastern division of the eastern judicial district of Missouri.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7034) to incorporate the International Sunday School Association of America.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution No. 49.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 16944) to amend section 878 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 7177. An act granting an increase of pension to Melvin L. Le Suer, alias James French;

S. 6510. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. Williams;

S. 7096. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret McCullough;

S. 6226. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Mickler;

S. 5672. An act granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Murphy;

S. 549. An act granting a pension to Louis T. Frech;

S. 4819. An act for the relief of M. A. Johnson;

- S. 4404. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Boyle;
 S. 4350. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Underwood;
 S. 2565. An act granting a pension to William P. Parrill;
 S. 1879. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo F. Harmon;
 S. 1178. An act providing for the resurvey of a township of land in Colorado; and
 S. 1160. An act to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the Committee on the District of Columbia (this being District Day) seems to have a pretty large Calendar. The Chair trusts that the House may be in order during the consideration of this business.

CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR STREETS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 23384) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved April 30, 1906, and entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets," be, and the same is hereby, amended by changing the section thereof designated section 491g so as to read:

"Sec. 491g. That of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land to be condemned for said opening, extension, widening, or straightening, plus the costs and expenses of the proceeding, such amount shall be assessed by the jury as benefits, and to the extent of such benefits against the lots, pieces, or parcels of land on each side of the street, avenue, road, or highway to be opened, extended, widened, or straightened, and against any and all other lots, pieces, or parcels of land which the jury may find will be benefited by the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, as the jury may find said lots, pieces, or parcels of land will be benefited; and in determining the amounts to be assessed against said lots, pieces, or parcels of land the jury shall take into consideration the respective situations and topographical conditions of said lots, pieces, or parcels of land, and the benefits and advantages they may severally receive from the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of the street, avenue, road, or highway. And where part of any lot, piece, parcel, or tract of land has been dedicated for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of the street, avenue, road, or highway, the jury, in determining whether the remainder of said lot, piece, parcel, or tract is to be assessed for benefits, and the amount of benefits, if any, to be assessed thereon, shall also take into consideration the fact of such dedication and the value of the land so dedicated. If the total amount of the damages awarded by the jury and the costs and expenses of the proceeding be in excess of the total amount of the assessments for benefits, such excess shall be borne and paid by the District of Columbia."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill to explain that portion of it to be found beginning with line 15, page 2:

And where part of any lot, piece, parcel, or tract of land has been dedicated for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of the street, avenue, road, or highway, the jury, in determining whether the remainder of said lot, piece, parcel, or tract is to be assessed for benefits, and the amount of benefits, if any, to be assessed thereon, shall also take into consideration the fact of such dedication and the value of the land so dedicated.

What I want to know is this: Suppose that a dedication is made by A, and B, C, and D own other parcels. Now, it seems to me that under the provisions of this act the benefits resulting from A's dedication might be applied to the benefit of B, C, and D.

Mr. OLCOTT. I disagree entirely with the gentleman from Iowa; but even if his construction of the amendment were right, the amendment merely directs the jury fixing the award and the benefits to take certain matters into consideration. It does not compel any change in action toward people who have dedicated property, but it does bring before the jury and make it imperative for them to have all of the facts before them when the matter is considered.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think the language will justify another construction than that. I think I did not make myself plain to the gentleman. Here we will say are four parties whose lots or parcels of land will be affected by a particular street opening. Now, A grants to the public a portion of that. The others do not. Here is a provision, it seems to me, that the dedication of A, being a benefit, shall be considered in estimating the damages of the other parties, B, C, and D.

Mr. OLCOTT. It seems to me that is a very strained construction of that provision. It says that where property has been dedicated for the opening the value of the land so dedicated shall be taken into consideration. It seems to me it would be a remarkably strained construction to say that because A dedicated some land that the value of some other land owned by B or C should be considered.

Mr. HEPBURN. That it should have the benefit of A's dedication.

Mr. OLCOTT. I do not think that could possibly be spelled out from this law. This is a matter which the corporation counsel has found to be a serious difficulty in condemnation proceedings. The amendment was prepared by the corporation counsel, and unquestionably the intention is that the dedication of A shall be considered in the awarding of benefits to A and not in the awarding of benefits to anybody else.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

FREE LECTURES.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 24746) for free lectures.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the board of education of the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, authorized to maintain a course or series of free evening lectures.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say in connection with this proposal to enact a law to establish a bureau of free lectures within the District of Columbia that the Committee on Appropriations have looked carefully into the proposition, and after the most thorough investigation decided that it was an expenditure of money that ought not to be made. It has been made from time to time in the past, but the amount of good accomplished by the expenditure was not such, in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, as to warrant its continuance. A few days ago, while the Committee of the Whole House was considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill, an item of this kind was sought to be introduced into that bill by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT], the author of this bill. The House at that time refused to adopt the amendment.

Mr. OLCOTT. If the gentleman will yield a moment—

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLCOTT. The House refused to adopt the amendment because the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], who had the bill in charge, raised against it a point of order, and it went out on that point.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it was refused, at any rate, and the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations was and is that this expenditure should not be saddled upon the District. I believe this bill should not pass at this time, and I hope it will not.

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman his reasons for opposing the appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. The reason the Committee on Appropriations opposed the appropriation was that it was simply the creation of a place to give employment to somebody, not because there was any desire on the part of anybody in the District to accomplish good for the District further than the good that might be accomplished by finding a place for somebody.

Mr. MORRELL. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question, as to whether he objects to the character of the lectures or the fact that free lectures should be given?

Mr. MADDEN. I object to the continuation of the lectures, for I believe that the public school system ought not to be saddled with expense of this character. The public education of the children of the District never contemplated the establishment of a lecture bureau outside of the schools. This expenditure is taken from the public moneys collected for educational purposes, intended to be expended through the public schools. The money heretofore has been spent for purposes not recognized by the school law.

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Does he know the number of those who attended these lectures during any one fiscal year?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I do not recollect now the number, but we have the number in the record of the hearings.

Mr. MORRELL. As far as I can remember, it amounted to over 20,000 people who were benefited by this small expenditure called for in this bill. This is practically on the same lines, as I understand it, as the university extension. This bill as drafted, as I have read it and as it passed the committee, does not specify that the entire salary shall be given to any one particular individual, but that it should be applied for the purpose of free lectures. It does not, in other words, create any place.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRELL] a question.

Who were these people that attended these lectures, school children or adults?

Mr. MORRELL. As far as I know there were a certain number of adults as well as school children.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Which predominated?

Mr. MORRELL. That I am unable to say.

Mr. MADDEN. These lectures are not intended for school children at all; they are intended for adults, and the adults under the school laws ought to be obliged to pay and are obliged to pay for their own education.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is passed, in my judgment, it should be amended in a very important respect. It should be amended so as to require these lectures to be delivered in the public school buildings. There have been in the past in the District of Columbia lectures given under an appropriation for free lectures—

Mr. OLCOTT. We will be perfectly willing to accept an amendment of that kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will suggest it when I am finished. As I was saying, there have been in the past free lectures given under an appropriation for free lectures which were supposed to be for the benefit of persons whose early education had been neglected. It was in pursuance of a scheme of university extension that had been adopted with great success in other of the large cities of the country. The Committee on Appropriations when it undertook the investigation of this question in this session discovered this fact, that all of these lectures had been delivered at the Carnegie Library. The surroundings there are of such a character that the persons for whose benefit the lectures were originally intended felt out of place, and as a matter of fact those for whose benefit the lectures were intended never attended the lectures at all.

For persons whose early education has been neglected and for whose benefit this course of lectures was arranged there were lectures delivered during the past year upon such interesting and elevating subjects for such persons as "Spanish architecture," "Tone and tone-producing qualities," and subjects of a similar character that would be of peculiar advantage to persons whose early education has been neglected. There has been continued strife over this course of free lectures. One faction desired that the school-teachers be compelled to attend and that the lectures be restricted to the school-teachers. Another faction has contended that they should be given for the benefit of those whose early education has been neglected and that the subjects should be adapted for such purposes. The result has been, however, that the purpose of the appropriation has been entirely diverted, and lectures have not been given either on the subjects or in the places where they could be of benefit to these people. If a series of free evening lectures is to be instituted and given in the public schools in the District in those localities where the residents will not feel that they are out of place in attending them, with the subjects chosen such that they will be of some advantage to them, then there might be some justification for appropriations for this purpose; but to continue the practice now in vogue of conducting a series of free lectures at the Carnegie Library for a restrictive class of persons, for persons who are not in need of this character of instruction, and to select subjects that are far beyond the comprehension of persons whose early education has been neglected, makes it, to my mind, an utterly unjustifiable expense. With the permission of the committee, I desire to offer an amendment—

Mr. OLCOTT. I would like to ask whether the gentleman from New York will be satisfied if we add, "Provided, That such lectures shall be held in some public school building in the District." We will be very glad to accept such an amendment as that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that would improve the bill immensely, and perhaps result in the selection of a class of subjects that would be of benefit to those for whom they are intended.

Mr. OLCOTT. Well, I suppose that matter should be left to the board of education.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been left to the board of education, and the result has been that all the lectures have been given at the Carnegie Library, where persons for whose benefit they were supposed to be held felt some delicacy about attending.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the cost of these lectures?

Mr. OLCOTT. Fifteen hundred dollars a year.

Mr. JAMES. For how many lectures?

Mr. OLCOTT. We had lectures lasting twenty-six weeks, and three or four a week.

Mr. JAMES. Upon what subjects are they—educational topics?

Mr. OLCOTT. They were upon general subjects; I can not give the complete list, but they were subjects of general practical interest to the people here.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. OLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman who selects these lecturers?

Mr. OLCOTT. They are selected by the board of education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is a lecturer selected by the board of education to serve for a year?

Mr. OLCOTT. There are a number of lecturers. There is no specific lecturer, but the board of education obtain the services of several to deliver lectures upon different subjects at different times and different places.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. How much do they pay for the lecturers?

Mr. OLCOTT. I can not tell you. All I know is the total expense the board of education asked for was \$1,500 a year.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then is this designed for the benefit of the students in the city schools that are under the age permitted to go to school, or is it designed for the general public?

Mr. OLCOTT. It is designed, of course, for the general public, but that includes the large number of children who can, under the laws of the District of Columbia, perform some work during the day and who do attend these lectures and who go there to get some of the education that they are deprived of by reason of their financial condition.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then let me ask the gentleman if he thinks this Government should endeavor to go beyond the free-school age and educate any person under 80 years of age? Is that the intention of this bill?

Mr. OLCOTT. I think the District of Columbia or the city of Washington can well follow the example of some of the great communities, especially the one I know most about—New York City—that has a most extensive series of lectures of the same character delivered in the public schools in the same way that we seek to have delivered here in the District.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the city of Washington or any city in the United States desires to instruct adult citizens, why should they not put up the money themselves and control it? Why should the General Government or a State government undertake to educate the adult citizens of any State or community?

Mr. OLCOTT. These are paid in the same manner that all appropriations for the city of Washington and District of Columbia are made. Half of it comes out of the District of Columbia treasury and half of it comes out of this Government. I think the gentleman's objection is rather to the method by which the District is financed. It is the city of Washington that is paying for these lectures.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. When a man becomes old the Government loses jurisdiction over him, and it is no longer the duty of any government to educate an adult citizen. We ought to educate the children of any city, State, or county, but we should not undertake to educate the adults of any city, State, or county.

Mr. OLCOTT. I do not think the gentleman would wish to be put in a position of declining to allow adults to go into these schools, when they are citizens here, and listening to the lectures.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would be in favor of maintaining the law for the child, but not for the adult, of any State or city.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with this bill probably because I have not had the educational advantages that my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has. He is a college graduate. My course in public schools, or any incorporated schools, for that matter, comprised five months, and for the rest of my education I have had to depend on my own efforts and those of my mother and other members of the family. Therefore I sympathize with men and women who have arrived at mature years and who have not had the advantages that such men as my distinguished and very dear colleague has. I think we ought to be ashamed of ourselves to hesitate over the expenditure of so small a sum as \$1,500 for the benefit of the laboring people and their wives and all those who have not had educational advantages.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is he quite certain that we are giving these for the benefit of the laboring people and those who have not had college opportunities?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to the gentleman that only last year I attended a meeting of the Central Labor Union of this city, at which this very provision was advocated for this very purpose, of giving laboring people and their wives and families the chance of obtaining this education. I do not vouch for the board of education, and I do not know whether they are fully performing their duty. They seem to be reversed in the courts with some degree of frequency, but the principle is all right, and if it is not being carried out according to its purpose and intent, then let us make the board of education carry it out that way.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman believe that this bill will compel the board of education to carry it out along the line of his thought?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I do not see why not. An amendment, I understand, is to be accepted by my colleague requiring these lectures to be given in a school building.

Mr. MADDEN. Heretofore the lectures have been given in the Carnegie Library building, amid gilt surroundings, where no one but aristocrats could attend the lectures.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That is going to be changed.

Mr. MADDEN. The lectures were upon subjects that only can be understood by those who have had a classical education.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That probably was an error.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not understand that the object of the gentleman from New York is to appropriate money to educate further along in classics those who have already been educated in that line.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Oh, no; I think it ought to be for the class of people who have not had the early advantages of education and those who have had just enough to give them a hunger for more; and they ought to have a chance to obtain it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman make it so that it shall only be for this class of people?

Mr. BENNET of New York. You can not do that, of course, because once you give a public lecture you have got to let all in.

Mr. JAMES. Would you be willing to extend these free lectures to the various cities throughout the United States?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Of course we have no jurisdiction of that.

Mr. JAMES. We have just as much right, I will say to the gentleman from New York, to appropriate for free lectures in Kentucky or Texas as we have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I will let my friend from California answer.

Mr. JAMES. This makes an extra tax on the whole of the people of the various States of this Union, and why should you lay it on the whole of the people for the benefit of these people here in the city of Washington while the whole people pay more taxes than they do?

Mr. KAHN. In answer to the gentleman from Kentucky I will say that in California all the university professors go all over the State and give these free lectures, and they are very largely attended.

Mr. JAMES. And the people of California pay for it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. But the General Government would pay for this.

Mr. KAHN. The General Government has jurisdiction in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JAMES. I believe that if the people of the District want this they ought to pay for it, and they ought not to ask the other people of the country to pay for it.

Mr. KAHN. They do pay half.

Mr. JAMES. But not all.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That same criticism would of course apply to any appropriation for the schools. If you take the gentleman's view, the people of his State or my State are paying pro rata in the same way.

Mr. JAMES. You say that the laboring people want this appropriation?

Mr. BENNET of New York. They do.

Mr. JAMES. Have they petitioned for it?

Mr. BENNET of New York. They did last year.

Mr. JAMES. As I understand the wishes of the laboring people they are asking and begging for other legislation here before this House which they can not even get upon this floor for consideration that is of a great deal more benefit to them than this pitiful sum of \$1,500.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That could be said possibly of any bill that is considered by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, does not the gentleman

from New York know that the whole of this \$1,500 will be absorbed as compensation to pay lecturers?

Mr. BENNET of New York. That is the way it ought to be, when furnished with the school buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. We have not the school buildings.

Mr. BENNET of New York. It is proposed now—

Mr. MADDEN. But we never had that up to now.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I am not talking about the past, but the present and the future. I look to the time when, with the school buildings, the whole \$1,500 will be absorbed for lectures, and there will be no expense outside of light and heat or any other legitimate expense.

Now, every large city, I think, in the United States has these free lectures. We are charged with responsibility for the city of Washington, one of the largest in the whole United States, and I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] said the other day, that it is our duty to make this city a model city, and we can not justify ourselves to our own consciences in refraining from doing it for the city of Washington when other cities, almost without exception, have adopted this plan as a part of their educational system. Why, in the Borough of Brooklyn, from which my friend Mr. FITZGERALD comes, last year there were 358,818 people who attended lectures in that borough alone—free public lectures. I have pictures of the crowded halls in that borough, showing that the houses were filled with the kind of people to whom lectures like that ought to be given. I hope the House will not be niggardly and will not be mean about a little matter of \$1,500, but will gladly join in aiding the educational system of the District of Columbia in every respect, and putting it in every regard on as high a plane as that of any other large city. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the amendment ought to be reported.

Mr. SIMS. I desire to have something to say on this bill before debate closes.

The SPEAKER. But an amendment has been offered and accepted which has not been reported.

Mr. OLCOTT. I will offer on behalf of the committee the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the bill "Provided, That said lectures shall be held in some public school building."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have permission from the gentleman to add, and to be considered as part of that amendment, the words:

Provided, That the expense thereof shall be paid entirely from the revenues of the District of Columbia as appropriated from time to time by Congress.

Will you accept that as an amendment to your amendment?

Mr. OLCOTT. I will not accept it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about the bill.

Mr. OLCOTT. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. SIMS. I wish ten minutes.

Mr. OLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was brought up for consideration before the committee I was informed, or understood, that this proposition was in the appropriation bill and went out on a point of order made against the Appropriations Committee, and on this account I offered no resistance to the report of the bill. I have learned since that this is not a fact, but that the amendment was offered to the appropriation bill and went out on a point of order made by members of the Appropriations Committee. Having supported the bill under a misapprehension, I do not feel bound to support it here.

As to the nature of the lectures that have heretofore been given under the appropriation previously made, I think my friend from New York [Mr. BENNET] can learn whether or not they are suitable for gentlemen who had no early opportunities, like the gentleman and myself, and whether or not they are the kind of lectures that are demanded by the laboring people. For instance, take those delivered in 1905. The first one was by H. W. Wiley, Ph. D.; subject, "Feeding preservative to young men." How much did my friend from New York lose by not having been taught that in his early youth? How much will the children of the District of Columbia lose if they do not go to hear such a lecture as that?

What else? Here was another, by Mr. Henry Oldys; subject, "Bird notes." How much did my friend from New York [Mr. BENNET] lose by not having studied that in his early youth? How much do the laboring people lose by not knowing all about bird notes? I learned a great deal about bird notes by mixing with the birds when I had hold of the plow handles; but I have

never seen a laboring man who worked for a living who cared how those bird notes were made, just so he had the birds and the notes. [Laughter.]

Now, in my laboring days I lost a great deal by not having studied Spanish architecture, which was the subject of a lecture by Mr. George O. Totten, jr. How many of our laboring people are engaged in the study of Spanish architecture? Another one was "Round the world in forty minutes." How much did my friend from New York lose in not knowing how to go around the world in forty minutes? See what stingy and parsimonious gentlemen the members of the Appropriations Committee are in trying to deprive us laboring people of knowing how to go around the world in forty minutes. Gentlemen, you are niggardly.

Here is another one by Rev. U. G. B. Pierce, subject "A night in the nether world." Oh, my laboring friends, how you are denied opportunities to know about nights in the nether world. You can learn all about nights in the sweatshops, and some of those sweatshops are not very far from where the gentleman from New York lives. Now my friend wants to teach them about the nether world.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Only on one point. I did not want to interrupt the flow of your eloquence or your bird notes.

Mr. SIMS. I did not know it was flowing.

Mr. BENNET of New York. But as to the sweatshops in New York City I want to say what the gentleman refers to would have been true three years ago, but that 95 per cent of the sweatshops in New York City have ceased to exist since that time.

Mr. SIMS. I am glad to hear that; but what about the nether world? Is there anything going on in New York to enlighten people about that? [Laughter.]

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will say that the gentleman from Tennessee and other people who do not live in New York, when they come there learn a great deal more about the nether world in New York City than we who live there all the time know about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. It is the only opportunity we have to know anything about it, when we go to New York, while you people who live there in the nether world do not have to go out to learn about it. It just comes to you naturally. [Laughter.]

Now, I call your attention to another lecture delivered by Rev. John Van Schaick, jr., subject "Vacation days in Scotland." How cruel it is to deny our laboring people of the opportunity to hear about vacation days in Scotland. It is true we have a few vacation days here, called "holidays;" so many of them that there is hardly time to educate the children on account of the holidays, holy weeks, and holy months. Of course you want to tax your constituents and mine to let the laboring people of the District of Columbia know about vacation days in Scotland. Take this entire list of subjects from one end to the other and I could beat any man in my district who would run for office and claim to be a laboring man who would favor the expenditure of money for such purposes as this. One-half of this comes from the people of your State and mine, where they learn the bird notes from their own birds and at their own expense, and I think the amendment is a just one. If the people of the District of Columbia and the laboring people here want these lectures, let them pay for them, because we in our country do not need to know anything about nights in the nether world, about Spanish architecture, about bird notes, about vacation days in Scotland, about how to go around the world in forty minutes, or anything else covered by these lectures here. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAMES) there were—ayes 81, noes 63.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. OLCOTT and Mr. STEPHENS of Texas were appointed tellers. The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 72, noes 76.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays 104, answering "present" 12, not voting 153, as follows:

YEAS—112.

Acheson	Cousins	Hull	Nelson
Allen, Me.	Cromer	Kahn	Olcott
Ames	Crumpacker	Keifer	Otjen
Babcock	Davidson	Kellher	Overstreet, Ind.
Barchfeld	Dawes	Kennedy, Nebr.	Parsons
Bartholdt	Dawson	Kinkaid	Pearre
Bates	Dovener	Knapp	Powers
Bede	Ellis	Knowland	Reeder
Bennet, N. Y.	Fassett	Lacey	Rhodes
Bonyne	Fitzgerald	Lafean	Rives
Bradley	Foster, Vt.	Landis, Frederick	Rodenberg
Brownlow	Fuller	Lilley, Pa.	Ruppert
Brumm	Gardner, Mass.	Littauer	Sherman
Buckman	Graham	Longworth	Sibley
Burke, S. Dak.	Greene	Lovering	Southard
Calder	Gronna	Lowden	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Hale	McCall	Sulloway
Campbell, Ohio	Haskins	McCarthy	Tawney
Capron	Hayes	McCreary, Pa.	Taylor, Ohio
Cassel	Henry, Conn.	McGavin	Towne
Chaney	Hepburn	McKinley, Ill.	Volstead
Chapman	Hermann	McNary	Vreeland
Cocks	Higgins	Mahon	Waldo
Cole	Hinshaw	Marshall	Wanger
Conner	Howell, N. J.	Martin	Watson
Cooper, Pa.	Hubbard	Moore, Pa.	Weeks
Cooper, Wis.	Huff	Mouser	Wiley, N. J.
Coudrey	Hughes	Murphy	Wood

NAYS—104.

Adamson	Garner	Lewis	Rucker
Beall, Tex.	Garrett	Lilley, Conn.	Russell
Bell, Ga.	Gilbert	Lloyd	Ryan
Bowers	Gilhams	McLain	Saunders
Bowersock	Gill	Macon	Scott
Brantley	Gillespie	Madden	Shackelford
Brick	Gillett	Mann	Shartel
Brooks, Tex.	Glass	Moon, Tenn.	Sheppard
Broussard	Gregg	Moore, Tex.	Sherley
Burleson	Hay	Murdock	Sims
Byrd	Hedge	Norris	Slomp
Candler	Heflin	Overstreet, Ga.	Smith, Ky.
Clark, Fla.	Henry, Tex.	Padgett	Smith, Md.
Clark, Mo.	Hogg	Page	Smith, Pa.
Clayton	Holliday	Patterson, N. C.	Smith, Tex.
Cushman	Hopkins	Patterson, S. C.	Snapp
Darragh	Houston	Pou	Sparkman
Davey, La.	Humphrey, Wash.	Prince	Spight
De Armond	James	Pujo	Stanley
Dixon, Ind.	Johnson	Randell, Tex.	Stephens, Tex.
Driscoll	Jones, Va.	Ransell, La.	Thomas, N. C.
Ellerbe	Jones, Wash.	Rhinoek	Trimble
Field	Lamar	Richardson, Ala.	Wallace
Flood	Lamb	Richardson, Ky.	Webb
Floyd	Lee	Robertson, La.	Young
Fulkerson	Lever	Robinson, Ark.	Zenor

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Bartlett	Finley	Hardwick	Jenkins
Butler, Pa.	Griggs	Humphreys, Miss.	Meyer
Deemer	Hamilton	Hunt	Small

NOT VOTING—153.

Alken	Edwards	Lindsay	Smith, Cal.
Alexander	Englebright	Littlefield	Smith, Ill.
Allen, N. J.	Esch	Livingston	Smith, Iowa
Andrus	Flack	Lorimer	Smith, Samuel W.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Loud	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bannon	Fordney	Loudenslager	Smyser
Beidler	Foss	McCleary, Minn.	Southall
Bennett, Ky.	Foster, Ind.	McDermott	Southwick
Bingham	Fowler	McKinley, Cal.	Sperry
Birdsall	French	McKinney	Steenerson
Bishop	Gaines, Tenn.	McLachlan	Sterling
Blackburn	Gaines, W. Va.	McMorran	Stevens, Minn.
Boutell	Garber	Maynard	Sullivan
Bowie	Gardner, Mich.	Michalek	Sulzer
Brooks, Colo.	Gardner, N. J.	Miller	Talbot
Brown	Goebel	Minor	Taylor, Ala.
Brundidge	Goldfogle	Mondell	Thomas, Ohio
Burgess	Goulden	Moon, Pa.	Tirrell
Burke, Pa.	Graff	Morrell	Townsend
Burleigh	Granger	Mudd	Tyndall
Burnett	Grosvenor	Needham	Underwood
Burton, Del.	Gudger	Nevin	Van Duzer
Burton, Ohio	Haugen	Olmsted	Van Winkle
Butler, Tenn.	Hearst	Palmer	Wachter
Calderhead	Hill, Conn.	Parker	Wadsworth
Cockran	Hill, Miss.	Payne	Washburn
Currier	Howard	Perkins	Watkins
Curtis	Howell, Utah	Pollard	Webber
Dale	Kennedy, Ohio	Rainey	Weems
Dalzell	Kitchin, Claude	Reid	Weisse
Davis, Minn.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Reynolds	Welborn
Davis, W. Va.	Klepper	Riordan	Wharton
Denby	Kline	Rixey	Wiley, Ala.
Dickson, Ill.	Knopf	Roberts	Williams
Dixon, Mont.	Landis, Chas. B.	Samuel	Wilson
Draper	Law	Schneebell	Woodyard
Dresser	Lawrence	Scroggy	
Dunwell	Le Fevre	Slayden	
Dwight	Legare		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. DALZELL with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. GRANGER.
 Mr. PAYNE with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 For the day:
 Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. BANNON with Mr. AIKEN.
 Mr. BIRDSALL with Mr. BURNETT.
 Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.
 Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. BARTLETT.
 Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. BOWIE.
 Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. HOWARD.
 Mr. DENBY with Mr. GARBER.
 Mr. DICKSON of Illinois with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.
 Mr. DOVENER with Mr. LINDSAY.
 Mr. DRAPER with Mr. GOULDEN.
 Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. WATKINS.
 Mr. FRENCH with Mr. VAN DUZER.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. BURGESS.
 Mr. JENKINS with Mr. WEISSE.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. GUDGER.
 Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. HEARST.
 Mr. LE FEVRE with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
 Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee.
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 Mr. MCKINNEY with Mr. RAINY.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. TALBOTT.
 Mr. NEEDHAM with Mr. MAYNARD.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SOUTHALL.
 Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. REID.
 Mr. PERKINS with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. REYNOLDS with Mr. RIXEY.
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. SLAYDEN.
 Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SULZER.
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.
 Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. LEGARE.
 Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK.
 Until further notice:
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. COCKRAN.
 Mr. LORIMER with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi.
 Mr. MORRELL with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.
 Mr. WACHTER with Mr. SMALL.
 For the session:
 Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.
 Mr. DEEMER with Mr. KLINE.
 Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER.
 Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. McDERMOTT.
 Mr. WILEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPRON). Has the gentleman already voted?

Mr. WILEY of Alabama. No, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called or should have been called?

Mr. WILEY of Alabama. No, sir; I was just outside.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentleman's vote can not be recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

ALBEMARLE STREET, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill (H. R. 23940) for the extension of Albemarle street NW., District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under and in accordance with the provisions of sections 491a to 491n, both inclusive, of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within sixty days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the opening of Albemarle street, from Wisconsin avenue to Murdock Mill road, with the uniform width of 90 feet, according to the permanent system of highway plans adopted in and for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That assessments shall be made by the jury as benefits as contemplated in section 491g of the subchapter of the Code hereinbefore referred to: *Provided*, That the total amount found to be due and awarded as damages, plus the cost and expenses of the proceedings, shall be assessed by the said jury as benefits.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$300, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto, to be repaid to

the District of Columbia from the assessments for benefits when the same are collected, and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of all judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

THE EXTENSION OF SCHOOL STREET NW.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 24932) for the extension of School street NW.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under and in accordance with the provisions of section 491a to 491n, both inclusive, of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within sixty days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute, in the supreme court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the extension of School street NW. from its present southern terminus to Irving street with a width of 50 feet.

SEC. 2. That assessments shall be made by the jury as benefits as contemplated in section 491g of the subchapter of the Code hereinbefore referred to: *Provided*, That the total amount found to be due and awarded as damages, plus the cost and expenses of the proceedings, shall be assessed by the said jury as benefits.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$600, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto, to be repaid to the District of Columbia from the assessment of benefits when the same are collected, and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of all judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

WIDENING OF MILLS AVENUE.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9326) for the widening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street.

The Clerk read the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under and in accordance with the provisions of sections 491a to 491n, both inclusive, of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within sixty days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the opening of Mills avenue, with a width of 50 feet, from Rhode Island avenue to its intersection with Twenty-fourth street NE.; said condemnation to be wholly to the westerly of the present easterly side of the private road known as "Mills avenue."

SEC. 2. That assessments shall be made by the jury as benefits as contemplated in section 491g of the subchapter of the Code hereinbefore referred to: *Provided*, That the total amount found to be due and awarded as damages, plus the cost and expenses of the proceedings, shall be assessed by the said jury as benefits.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$300, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto, to be repaid to the District of Columbia from the assessment for benefits when the same are collected, and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of all judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to prepare a new highway plan for that portion of the District of Columbia lying west of said Mills avenue, north of Frankfort street, east of Twentieth street, and south of Rhode Island avenue NE., under the provisions contained in the act of Congress approved March 2, 1893, entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," and an amendment to said act approved June 28, 1898; that upon the completion and recording of said new highway plan it shall take the place of and stand for any previous plan for said portion of the District of Columbia.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the opening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street."

INCORPORATION OF BANKS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 21669) to provide for the incorporation of banks within the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That associations for carrying on the business of banking within the District of Columbia may be formed by any number of natural persons, not less in any case than five, by entering into articles of association and executing an organization certificate in the same manner and to the same extent as prescribed by sections 5133, 5134, and 5135 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the organization of national banks. Upon duly making and filing articles of association and an organization certificate with the Comptroller of the Currency in the manner provided by the foregoing sections, the association shall become, as from the date of the execution of its organization certificate, a body corporate, and as such it shall have power to do a general

banking business within the District of Columbia, when authorized by the Comptroller of the Currency, in the manner provided by section 5169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, but no association shall be organized under this act with a less capital than \$100,000, divided into shares of \$100 each. Such capital shall be paid in cash in the manner prescribed by sections 5140 and 5141 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the shareholders shall be held individually responsible, equally and ratably, and not for one another, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such association to the extent of the amount of their stock therein, at the par value thereof, in addition to the amount invested in such shares, and such liability may be enforced by the Comptroller of the Currency in the manner provided by the national banking laws.

SEC. 2. That any savings bank, or savings company, or trust company, or other banking institution organized under authority of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902, or organized by virtue of the laws of any of the States of this Union, and having an office or banking house located within the District of Columbia where deposits or savings are received, may become a banking association under this act in the manner provided by section 5154 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the conversion of State banks into national associations.

SEC. 3. That from and after the 1st day of —, anno Domini 1907, no person, company, association, copartnership, or corporation, except associations organized under the national-bank act, corporations organized under an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the incorporation of trust, loan, mortgage, and certain other corporations within the District of Columbia," approved October 1, 1890, and corporations organized under this act, shall transact a banking business, or maintain an office or banking house where deposits or savings are received, within the District of Columbia. Any person, and any officer or agent of any company, firm, or corporation who shall wilfully violate any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by imprisonment not longer than two years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 4. That section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the punishment of offenses against the national banking laws, shall apply to organizations formed or converted under this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 3, strike out all, commencing with the word "that," in line 5, down to and including the word "Columbia," in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1908, no person, company, association, copartnership, or corporation shall transact a banking business or maintain an office or banking house where deposits or savings are received, within the District of Columbia, except associations organized under the national-bank act, corporations organized under an act of Congress entitled 'An act to provide for the incorporation of trust, loan, mortgage, and certain other corporations within the District of Columbia,' approved October 1, 1890, except also any person, firm, or company regularly licensed to engage in the business of private banking in the District of Columbia prior to the 1st day of January, 1906, and corporations organized under this act."

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to have some explanation as to what the changes are and what the objects are.

Mr. OLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and others.

Mr. MANN. The "gentleman from Illinois" is seeking information.

Mr. OLCOTT. I will be very glad to give the gentleman all the information that I can. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that was introduced to correct the abuses that have grown up in the District of Columbia by reason of certain banking corporations being rather loosely governed. The bill was supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINE], who is unavoidably absent, and I have been asked to report the bill. The amendment that is suggested provides the same care in allowing incorporations of banking institutions here as is made necessary by the national banking act. It necessitates a fully paid-in capital of \$100,000, with the same stock liability on these banks that may hereafter be organized in the District of Columbia as is required now under the national banking act.

Mr. MANN. In an incorporation what is the present limit as to the amount?

Mr. OLCOTT. I can not tell what the present limit is. I think it may be in the report, but if you will allow me just one moment, I will say that the bill has been entirely approved by the Comptroller of the Currency and makes these new banks to be established directly responsible to the Comptroller, and brings them under the general supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency in the same manner that the national banks are, and makes the stockholders liable in the same way for the par value of their stock.

Mr. MANN. Of course no one, I think, will object to that, but is there nothing else in the bill?

Mr. OLCOTT. There is nothing else in the bill. The bill was introduced by and had the sanction of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINE], who is the member of the committee most conversant with banking matters, and is in the line of safe and conservative banking, and to prevent what we might call "wild-cat" banking concerns, which have frequently existed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what the pres-

ent requirements are for the granting of licenses to private bankers? I notice in the bill that there is an amendment which excepts from the operation of this act those doing a private banking business who have received a license prior to the 1st day of January, 1906. I would like to have the gentleman explain the regulations which are in force under the present method, and what the reason is for making this exception.

Mr. OLCOTT. Exception was made because it was conclusively shown to the committee, and especially to the subcommittee which had this matter in charge, that there were four private banking institutions which would be affected by this who had received heretofore, under the general law, licenses and whose credit was of such high standing that it seemed unfair to them to change their method of business in any way whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will not this bill by forbidding licenses in the future to private bankers give these four a monopoly and a great and undue advantage over all other persons who will be hereafter required to do a banking business under the provisions in this bill?

Mr. OLCOTT. I am quite certain that will not obtain, because these licenses compel the proper report to the Comptroller and, I believe, are hedged around by every possible safety.

Mr. STAFFORD. What objection could be advanced by these private bankers to being compelled to incorporate and operate under the general provisions of this proposed law as originally intended? It is certainly giving four or five private bankers an undue advantage over others simply because they have been established heretofore.

Mr. OLCOTT. Because they have been established and have been doing such an entirely conservative, proper, and substantial banking business for so many years it would seem as if injustice would be done them—

Mr. STAFFORD. But you are denying that privilege to all others who might seek that privilege hereafter, and you are giving these four bankers a decided advantage by permitting them to continue. What objection could be made, if the committee thought it advisable, to have all persons doing a banking business incorporate under the general provisions and report as required in this bill?

Mr. OLCOTT. I think that one of these particular banks that was most recently established was established in 1856.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are many instances of private banks who subsequently incorporated, and I would like to have the gentleman advance some reason or state what hardship would be entailed to provide that these bankers should incorporate under the provisions of this bill, rather than giving them a special privilege.

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, I can say to the gentleman that there are four or five institutions here that are bankers and brokers. They have a name that is their capital and credit—their reputation. They appeared before the committee, appeared before the Commissioners, and also before the Comptroller of the Currency, and the bill was amended at the suggestion and by the consent of the Comptroller and the Commissioners to omit these three or four old-established concerns.

Mr. STAFFORD. What privilege would these private bankers have which they would not have if they were incorporated under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BABCOCK. They have no privileges, except they have an old name which is a part of their capital.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Riggs National Bank formerly did business as private bankers under the name of Riggs & Co., and subsequently were incorporated. What reason can the gentleman give why these establishments should be given this special privilege?

Mr. OLCOTT. I think I can answer the gentleman by reading from the second page of the report:

The amendment which your committee recommends, exempting the regularly licensed private banks, was recommended by the Commissioners after the bill had been introduced. Your committee is informed that this provision will result in exempting from the provisions of the act four copartnerships which have been doing business in the District, one since 1856, and the youngest since 1890. These firms do not conduct a general banking business, do not receive savings deposits, the chief element of their business being for the convenience of their patrons for whom they make investments.

Mr. STAFFORD. But what hardship would it entail upon these private bankers if they were required to be incorporated?

Mr. OLCOTT. The Comptroller of the Currency has also specially sanctioned this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the Comptroller, in this language, says that it might be a convenience, in effect, to these private bankers if they be allowed to continue the private banking privilege; but you do not advance any reason why they should not be required to incorporate under the general law.

Mr. BABCOCK. Why, Mr. Speaker, these concerns are all

doing principally a brokerage business. They call themselves bankers and brokers.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, if they are incorporated they would have to abandon their business as brokers; and if this law went into effect they could not receive the deposits of their customers. It would practically drive them out of business.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there are a great many other brokers who would be permitted to continue.

Mr. BABCOCK. There are only four of these concerns.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that these are stock brokers?

Mr. BABCOCK. They are brokers and investment houses, not doing a banking business; but that is all they can do under the provisions of this law.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, they are ordinary stock brokers.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And they receive money on deposit so as to have the money there with which to make purchases or have money on deposit which they realize from purchases or sales?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now, then, does the gentleman mean that this bill is to prohibit anybody else engaging in the broker business in the District of Columbia, except these four concerns now engaged in business?

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Would not that be the effect?

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, no; but they are given the right to use the name of bank; that is all.

Mr. MANN. But that is not what the bill says at all.

Mr. OLCOTT. That is exactly what it does.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is exactly the proposition. We have had the same situation in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. OLCOTT. And in New York.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I thought the gentleman was mistaken. This bill says: "No person shall transact a banking business or maintain a business or banking house where deposits are received." So that under this bill "no person," "no partnership," "no concern" of any kind can hold an office or receive deposits of money, which means that no new brokerage house can be established in Washington. This bill would be purely in the interest, but not intentionally, of those four brokerage concerns now in Washington, and no new concern could be established. I do not know their names and do not do any business with them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Would not that result in establishing a monopoly in the brokerage business in the four concerns that are now engaged in it?

Mr. BABCOCK. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not?

Mr. BABCOCK. There are 50 other brokers here, and it would not have that effect at all.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's claim was that it was absolutely necessary, in order to conduct a brokerage business, that the brokers should be entitled to receive deposits, or to retain deposits after moneys had been realized.

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman well knows that if he gives a broker an order to buy a thousand dollars' worth of bonds, when he gives his order he has to make a deposit of either the whole or a part of what is to be paid for the bonds. That is the business of a broker; but these brokers can not do a banker's business—the receiving of deposits of money for safe-keeping or anything of that kind.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not confine the bill to the banking business. This bill says:

No person, company, association, partnership, or corporation shall transact a banking business or maintain an office where deposits are received.

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois, could not these four brokerage firms incorporate as a bank and retain their names and then separate their banking and brokerage business, and go on?

Mr. MANN. Of course; that is undoubtedly correct. I have no expression of opinion to make as to whether these brokers should be required to incorporate or not, but I do not see the object of passing a law which turns over all the brokerage business to four concerns, whoever they may be. I do not know the names of them, and I do not know whom they are.

Mr. OLCOTT. These four particular concerns are the only ones that do a banking business along with a brokerage business. It is not going to affect the other brokers.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman proposes to give them a monopoly.

Mr. OLCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. OLCOTT. Of the brokerage business—not in the slightest degree. We propose to allow them to continue the business they now carry on, which has the sanction of the Comptroller of the Currency, who has looked after it with a great deal of care.

Mr. MANN. The business of the Comptroller of the Currency is only to look at it from the banking standpoint.

Mr. OLCOTT. I presume he has.

Mr. MANN. But you go away beyond the banking provision. You provide that nobody shall maintain an office where deposits are received.

Mr. OLCOTT. We do not go beyond anything that the Comptroller of the Currency has approved.

Mr. MANN. I say the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency on such a proposition is valueless. That is not the duty of the Comptroller of the Currency. He does not interest himself on that point. The Comptroller of the Currency confines his recommendation to those matters that come within the jurisdiction of his office, and that is only the matter of banking. You go away beyond that.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the committee consider that a broker should not be permitted to do a banking business?

Mr. OLCOTT. It considers, and the bill provides, that a broker shall not do business as a banker and use the words "banker" or "banking house."

Mr. SHERLEY. Did the committee think it fair that these four firms should be excluded from what they considered to be a salutary rule?

Mr. OLCOTT. The four concerns referred to have been required to obtain banking licenses, and have obtained them. Brokers are not required to obtain banking licenses. The committee considered that those who prior to 1890 obtained these licenses should not have their licenses revoked by the operation of this bill. They are the only four people concerned, because they are the only people who have obtained licenses.

Mr. SHERLEY. That makes it all the worse. If I understand the contention of the committee aright, it is this: You propose to divorce the brokerage business from the banking business. Is that true?

Mr. OLCOTT. Yes; to the extent of using the words "banking house" or "banker."

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, although you think that is salutary, yet because there happened to be four men who do now combine the two businesses, they are to be excepted from the operation of this bill.

Mr. OLCOTT. We are allowing the people who have already received bankers' licenses from the Comptroller of the Currency to go on and act under those licenses, and not take them away from them.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman consider that it becomes right to have the brokerage and banking business united because it has so existed with the gentleman, but wrong for those who have not heretofore united the two pursuits?

Mr. OLCOTT. "The gentleman" does not consider that at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then what equity exists because these men have been doing something which you now, as a committee, declare is not a proper thing to be done, to wit, the joining of a banking and brokerage business?

Mr. OLCOTT. "The gentleman" does believe that when a license has been given by the United States of America, through its Comptroller of the Currency, these people should not easily be divested of their vested rights.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman thinks, then, that if a wrong has been done, having been done, it should be a continuing wrong?

Mr. OLCOTT. I do not think that is a fair conclusion to be reached. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OLCOTT) there were—ayes 27, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, before that question is taken I think I ought to say that I do not think the bill is in such shape, without the committee amendment, as will meet the approval of the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw the bill at this time.

Mr. BABCOCK. And I would ask that it be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? Without

objection, it will be so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what is the request? It was impossible to hear the Chair state the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request was that the bill be withdrawn and be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Chair will state that there seemed to the Chair to be no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move that the bill do lie upon the table, if I have an opportunity.

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is too late.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. I was unable to hear the request stated by the Chair, and would have objected had I heard it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman was on his feet, and if he was on his feet the Chair would be inclined to think that he was in time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was endeavoring to ascertain the request that the Chair was stating. I did not hear it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will assume that the gentleman was in time to make objection, if he so desired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. Would it be in order now to move to recommit the bill to the committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair put it as a request for unanimous consent, but a motion of the kind made by the gentleman from Wisconsin would be in order, if he desires to make that motion.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, then I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERLEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Would a motion that the bill do lie upon the table be in order and take precedence of the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to lay upon the table would have precedence.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then I move that the bill do lie upon the table.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then I wish to say to the gentleman—

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that that is a motion which is not debatable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the motion to lay upon the table is not debatable, if that point be made.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to make a statement with reference to the matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to a statement being made by the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes originally from the Comptroller of the Currency through the Commissioners and contains very many important features. I think it would be unfortunate and a mistake to lay the bill on the table. Whether the committee can re-report it in such form as will meet the approval of the House I can not say at this time, but I certainly think it will be an error to lay it on the table, and I hope that will not be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the bill do lie on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY) there were—ayes 25, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

PROTECTION OF PROPERTY IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.*

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 23941) to amend section 14 of the act approved July 29, 1892, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 of the act approved July 29, 1892, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," be amended by inserting after the phrase "between the setting and rising of the sun" the following: "And no person shall kindle or set on fire, or be present, aiding, consenting, or causing such to be done, in any front or

rear yard or inclosed ground or lot at any time, within 200 feet of any premises, stable, shed, or other building, or inflammable structure or property, any box, barrel, refuse, straw, shavings, or other combustible;" so that the said section shall read as follows:

"Sec. 14. That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons within the limits of the District of Columbia to kindle or set on fire, or be present, aiding, consenting, or causing it to be done, in any street, avenue, road, or highway, alley, open ground, or lot, any box, barrel, straw, shavings, or other combustible, between the setting and rising of the sun, and no person shall kindle or set on fire, or be present, aiding, consenting, or causing such to be done, in any front or rear yard or inclosed ground or lot at any time, within 200 feet of any premises, stable, shed, or other building, or inflammable structure or property, any box, barrel, refuse, straw, shavings, or other combustible; and any person offending against the provisions of this act shall, on conviction thereof, forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding \$10 for each and every offense."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOPYING OLD RECORDS IN OFFICE OF RECORDER OF DEEDS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 22350, to authorize the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia to recopy old records in his office, and for other purposes, and which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to recopy such of the records in his office as may, in his judgment and that of the supreme court of said District, or one of its justices appointed by it for that purpose, need recopying in order to preserve the originals from destruction: *Provided,* That the expense thereof shall not in any one fiscal year exceed the sum of \$1,000, at a rate of compensation not exceeding that now authorized, certified to by the said supreme court, or by one of its justices appointed by it for that purpose, and audited and allowed by the proper accounting officer of the Treasury.

Sec. 2. That section 553 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia be so amended as to give authority to the recorder of deeds of the said District to appoint a cashier for his office and pay said cashier a salary not exceeding _____ dollars per annum, to be certified to and audited and allowed as now provided.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some information about this bill. It seems to me that there is something extraordinary in some of its sections. Why should the copying of all of the records in that office be left to the sole discretion of the clerk? Why should he have authority to determine how much of the records in the office shall be copied?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it seems that a large number of the records in the office of the recorder of deeds are very, very old. Some of them are as old as a hundred and twelve years.

Mr. GILBERT. I am not speaking of that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. If you will let me proceed, I will explain the purpose of this bill. That is what you asked about. The records have become very much mutilated and in some cases are in very bad shape. The object of the bill is to provide for their recopying and is restricted to \$1,000 a year expenditure, so that there shall be a gradual renewing and bringing up of these old and worn-out records in order to preserve them without any danger of clouding the titles to property in this District. It does not provide for the expenditure of any large sum of money at one time, but the bill provides that not to exceed \$1,000 a year shall be spent, not out of the Public Treasury, but out of the revenues of the office which are in excess of the expenses, and thereby gradually bring these records to a state of perfection and in that way preserve the papers and render the danger of loss or mutilation nil.

Mr. GILBERT. My question was directed to an entirely different proposition, and that was, conceding the records were old and mutilated, it occurred to me it would not be proper to delegate to the clerk the sole power to determine whether those records were mutilated so as to require their copying or not. He himself, deriving a revenue from the copying, would of course proceed to spend the thousand dollars a year for that purpose, whereas if the secretary or some other—

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. That is exactly what the bill provides, if the gentleman will read, that the judgment as to what records shall be restored lies with the justices of the supreme court of the District, and they direct him how to expend not to exceed \$1,000 a year.

Mr. GILBERT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have improperly intruded myself in this discussion. I did not hear that feature of the bill read at the outset.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. That is in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REGISTERED NURSES.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12690) to define the term of "registered nurse" and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the expiration of the ninety days immediately following the passage of this act no person shall, in the District of Columbia, in any manner whatsoever, represent herself to be a registered nurse, or allow herself to be so represented, unless she has been and is registered by the nurses' examining board in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Sec. 2. That upon the taking effect of this act the Graduate Nurses' Association of the District of Columbia shall nominate ten of its members who have had not less than five years' experience in the profession. These nominations shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall, from said nominations, appoint, within thirty days after said nominations are submitted to them, a nurses' examining board to be composed of five members. All appointments shall be made so that the term of one member shall expire on the 30th day of June of each year, and upon the expiration of the term of office of any examiner the said Commissioners shall likewise fill the vacancy for a term of five years from a list of three nominees submitted to them each year by the Graduate Nurses' Association of the District of Columbia. An unexpired term shall be filled by said Commissioners from three additional names furnished by the Graduate Nurses' Association upon request of the said Commissioners. No member of said board shall enter upon the discharge of her duties until she has taken oath to faithfully and impartially perform the same; and the said Commissioners may remove any member of said board for neglect of duty or for any just cause.

Sec. 3. That the nurses' examining board shall meet in the District of Columbia within ten days after their appointment and organize the board, and annually thereafter shall meet in the month of April and shall elect from its members a president, and also a secretary who shall be treasurer. It shall frame all such by-laws as it shall deem necessary for carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and may amend such rules from time to time at discretion of said board. The secretary shall be required to keep a record of all meetings of the board, and also a register of the names of all nurses duly registered under this act, and to furnish a certificate of registration to all such nurses. The said board shall hold examinations not less frequently than once a year, and the notice of each examination shall be given in one daily newspaper published in Washington City and in one nursing journal at least thirty days prior to said examination.

Sec. 4. That every nurse desiring to style herself "a registered nurse" in the District of Columbia shall make application to the nurses' examining board for registration, and at the time of making such application shall pay to the treasurer of said board \$5. Said applicant must furnish satisfactory evidence that she is over 23 years of age, of good moral character, and free from habits liable to interfere with her services as a nurse, and, further, that she holds a diploma from a training school for nurses which has been registered by the nurses' examining board of the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That no training school shall be registered which does not maintain proper educational standards and give not less than two years' training in a general hospital, or instruction of the same kind, and, to at least the same extent, as that given in the general hospital, all of which shall be determined by the nurses' examining board.

Sec. 5. That any person possessing the qualifications required in section 4 of this act who has been engaged in nursing in the District of Columbia five years after graduation immediately preceding the passage of this act shall be entitled to registration without examination upon payment of the registration fee. And, further, that any person who has been engaged in nursing in the District of Columbia for four years immediately preceding the passage of this act and shall have spent, in addition, one year in a hospital or sanatorium, shall be permitted to register after passing a practical examination: *Provided*, That such certificates shall not declare that the persons holding them have fulfilled all the requirements expressed in section 4.

Sec. 6. That the registration of any person as a nurse in the District of Columbia may be revoked and the certificate of such person canceled if she be found to have obtained the same by fraud, or be found guilty by the nurses' examining board of any act derogatory to the standing and morals of the profession of nursing. But before any certificate shall be revoked the holder thereof shall be entitled to thirty days' notice of the charges against her, and after a full and fair hearing the certificate can be revoked by a majority vote of the whole board.

Sec. 7. That all expenses incident to the execution of the provisions of this act shall be paid from the fees collected from applicants for registration as nurses, and if any balance remains on hand on the 30th day of June of any year the secretary and treasurer of the nurses' examining board shall receive of such balance the sum of \$100, and each other member of the said board shall receive \$5 for each day actually spent in the discharge of official duties. All moneys shall be paid to the treasurer of the board and shall be paid out under the orders of the board.

Sec. 8. That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$200 or by imprisonment in the workhouse for a period not exceeding sixty days.

Sec. 9. That the nurses' examining board shall have power to register, in like manner, without examination, any person who has been registered as a professional nurse in another State or Territory under laws which in the opinion of said board maintain a standard substantially equivalent to that provided for by this act.

Sec. 10. That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any person from nursing any other person in the District of Columbia either gratuitously or for hire, provided that such person so nursing shall not represent herself as being a registered nurse. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing any person to practice medicine or surgery, or midwifery, in said District otherwise than in accordance with an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof," approved June 3, 1896.

Sec. 11. That the word "she" and the derivatives thereof, wherever they occur in this act, shall be construed so as to include the word "he" and derivatives.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 4, line 3, insert after the word "act" the following:
"Or shall have graduated from any training school in the District of

Columbia within the five years immediately preceding the passage of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

VETERINARY SURGEONS.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 5698) to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, created a board of examiners in veterinary medicine, to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which shall consist of five reputable practitioners of veterinary medicine who shall have graduated from some college authorized by law to confer degrees, each of whom shall have been a bona fide resident of said District for three years last past before appointment, and each, during said period, shall have been actively engaged in the practice of his profession in said District. The appointments first made shall be one for one year, one for two years, one for three years, one for four years, and one for five years, and thereafter appointments shall be for a period of five years, except such as are occasioned by death, resignation, or removal, in which cases the appointments shall be for the remainders of the unexpired terms: *Provided*, That the said Commissioners may, in their judgment, remove any member of said board for neglect of duty or other sufficient cause, after due notice and hearing.

Sec. 2. That the said board of examiners in veterinary medicine shall elect a president, vice-president, secretary, and such other officers as shall be necessary. The secretary of said board shall have power to administer oaths or affirmations upon such matters as pertain to the business of said board, and any person willfully making any false oath or affirmation shall be deemed guilty of perjury; and said board shall make, alter, or amend, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act, and shall hold such meetings as shall be necessary for the transaction of business, and shall issue all licenses to practice veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia. Said board shall keep an official record of its meetings, and also an official register of all applicants for licenses, which register shall show the name, age, place, and duration of residence of each applicant, the time spent in the study of veterinary medicine in and out of medical schools, and the names and locations of all medical schools which have granted said applicant any degree or certificate of attendance upon lectures, and it shall also show whether said applicant was rejected or licensed under this act, and said register shall be prima facie evidence of all matters contained therein. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have power to require any or all officers of said board to give bond to the District of Columbia in such form and penalty as they may deem proper. The said board shall in the month of July in each year submit to said Commissioners a full report of its transactions during the twelve months immediately preceding.

Sec. 3. That from and after the passage of this act all persons desiring to practice veterinary medicine or any branch thereof in the District of Columbia, or who shall desire to hold themselves out to the public as practicing veterinary medicine or any branch thereof in the District of Columbia, shall make application to said board of examiners in veterinary medicine for a license so to do. Application for this purpose shall be upon a form furnished by said board, and shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence of good moral character, and by a diploma from some veterinary college authorized by law to confer the same, which college shall require at least two sessions of study of veterinary medicine of not less than six months each prior to the issue of such diploma, and graduates of two-year colleges shall accompany their diplomas by satisfactory evidence that they have practiced veterinary medicine for five years last past subsequent to the issue of such diplomas, and by a fee of \$10, except as herein otherwise directed, and from the fund thus created the board shall pay such necessary expenses as it may incur. Such expenses shall not exceed in any one fiscal year the amount of fees collected during that period, but if any balance remain after paying all such expenses the Commissioners of said District shall authorize the payment therefrom to the members of said board for their services of such amounts as said Commissioners deem proper. Said board shall, by means of examinations, ascertain the professional qualifications of all applicants for license to practice veterinary medicine in said District, and shall issue such licenses to all who are found by such examinations to be, in the judgment of said board, competent to so practice; and no such license shall be issued to any person who has not so demonstrated his competence, except as hereinafter otherwise provided. Such examinations shall be held in January, April, July, and October of each year, and shall include all such subjects as are ordinarily included in the curricula of veterinary colleges in good standing, but examinations may be held at such other times and include such other subjects as said board shall authorize and direct. Said board shall number consecutively all applications received, note upon each the disposition made of it, and preserve the same for reference, and shall number consecutively all licenses issued.

Sec. 4. That said board of examiners, so far as may be possible, shall make arrangements with analogous boards of the several States and Territories whereby due credit for State and Territorial licenses will be allowed in the District of Columbia to such licensees of said boards as desire to secure licenses to practice veterinary medicine in this District, and whereby licensees of the board of examiners in veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia will secure due credit for licenses issued by said board whenever such licensees desire to secure licenses to practice veterinary medicine in any State or Territory; but no arrangement shall be made under the provisions of this section which will be liable to lower the standard of practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia, and no arrangement for the mutual recognition of licenses shall be valid until it has been approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 5. That any person who has received a diploma from a veterinary college lawfully authorized to confer the same and who has maintained an office for the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia on or before the passage of this act, upon submission of proof of such facts to the board of examiners in veterinary medicine and the payment of a fee of \$1, shall be licensed by said

board to practice veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia without examination. Any person, not a graduate of a college lawfully authorized to confer a degree in veterinary medicine, who has been continuously engaged in the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia for five years previous to the passage of this act and has maintained an office in said District for that purpose shall be permitted to present himself for examination before the board of veterinary examiners without fee, and upon proof of satisfactory knowledge of veterinary medicine shall be registered and licensed as a practitioner of veterinary medicine.

Sec. 6. That any person having been examined by said board of examiners in veterinary medicine and having been refused a license as the result of such examination may, within thirty days after formal notification of such refusal, appeal from the decision of said board. Such appeal must be in writing, addressed to the Commissioners of said District, setting forth the ground upon which it is based, and accompanied by a deposit of \$30. If, after examination of said appeal, said Commissioners deem it proper, they shall appoint a board of review, consisting of three practitioners of veterinary medicine having qualifications similar to those required of members of the regular board of examiners in veterinary medicine, which board shall review the examination of appellant, and if they deem necessary reexamine him and report their finding to said Commissioners; and such finding shall be final and binding upon all parties concerned, and if favorable to the appellant the board of examiners in veterinary medicine shall issue to him a license to practice veterinary medicine in said District. Each member of said board of review shall be paid a fee of not more than \$10 for each candidate examined, payment to be made from the deposit of the appellant if the finding is adverse to him, but otherwise from the funds of the board of examiners. If favorable, the amount deposited shall be returned to the appellant.

Sec. 7. That every person practicing veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia, or representing himself or permitting himself to be represented as so practicing, shall display or cause to be displayed conspicuously in his usual place of business his license to practice in said District. Said place of business shall, during all reasonable hours, be open to inspection by any representative of the police department or of the board of examiners in veterinary medicine of said District, so far as may be necessary to examine such licenses, and it shall be unlawful for any person to interfere with any inspection made or intended to be made for this purpose.

Sec. 8. That from and after the passage of this act any person shall be regarded as practicing veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia who shall, in said District, append or cause to be appended to his name the letters V. S., D. V. M., V. M. D., M. D. V., M. D. C., D. V. S., or M. R. C. V. S., or the words "veterinary," "veterinarian," "veterinary surgeon," or "veterinary dentist," "veterinary farrier," "veterinary horse-shoer," "horse dentist," or "horse doctor," or who shall prescribe, advise, or apply any drug or medicine or other agency, or who shall perform any operation for the treatment, relief, or cure of any sick, diseased, or injured lower animal, or for commercial purposes, or who shall publicly profess to do any of these things, and shall charge or receive therefor money or other compensation, directly or indirectly.

Sec. 9. That this act shall not apply to veterinary surgeons in the Army or in the employ of the Agricultural Department who are graduates of regular veterinary colleges, nor to regularly licensed veterinarians in actual consultation from other States, nor to regularly licensed veterinarians actually called from other States to attend cases in the District of Columbia, but who do not open an office or appoint a place to do business within said District.

Sec. 10. That the board of examiners in veterinary medicine hereby created may, by a vote of four members, revoke or suspend for a time certain the license of any person to practice veterinary medicine or any branch thereof in the District of Columbia after notice and hearing, for any of the following causes, namely: The employment of fraud or deception in passing the examinations or in obtaining a license, chronic inebriety, or conviction of crime involving moral turpitude. The method of complaint, form and length of notice, and time of hearing charges against any licensee for any of the above causes shall be according to the rules and regulations to be made, subject to the approval of said Commissioners, as hereinbefore provided. Appeal from the decision of said board may be taken to the court of appeals of the District of Columbia, and the decision of said court shall be final: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the said board of review, and the board of examiners in veterinary medicine shall not, nor shall any of them, be required to pay costs, or give bond or security on appeal or error or other proceeding in any court or courts of the District of Columbia growing out of any official duty or duties imposed on them, or any of them, by this act.

Sec. 11. That any person who shall violate or aid or abet in violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$200 or by imprisonment in the workhouse of the District of Columbia for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 12. That it shall be the duty of the corporation counsel or one of his assistants to prosecute all violations of the provisions of this act.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 8, strike out all commencing with the word "or" in line 8 where it appears the second time, down to and including the comma after the word "purposes" in line 10.

Page 8, line 13, strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following:

"*Provided*, That any person may without compensation apply any medicine or remedy and perform any operation for the treatment, relief, or cure of any sick, diseased, or injured animal."

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

STOCK YARDS, SLAUGHTERHOUSES, AND PACKING HOUSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 23830) governing the maintenance of stock yards, slaughterhouses, and packing houses in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person shall slaughter for food any cattle, sheep, swine, calf, or goat elsewhere than in a registered slaughterhouse.

Sec. 2. That every owner and every manager of any place for keeping cattle, sheep, swine, calves, or goats to be used for food, hereinafter designated a stock yard; and every manager and every owner of any place for slaughtering cattle, sheep, swine, calves, or goats, hereinafter designated a slaughterhouse; and every owner and every manager of any place for the manufacture or preparation of meat products for sale, hereinafter designated a packing house, and every of the aforesaid places that is in operation at the time of the promulgation of these regulations, shall, on or before the expiration of three months immediately following the promulgation thereof, register his full name and residence and the location of such slaughterhouse, stock yard, or packing house in a book kept in the health office for that purpose. Every owner and every manager of any slaughterhouse, stock yard, or packing house that is established after the promulgation of these regulations shall, within five days after beginning business, register in like manner. In event of a change in the owner or the manager or in the location of any slaughterhouse, stock yard, or packing house the new owner or new manager, as the case may be, or in event of a change in location the manager or the owner shall call at the health office within five days after such change takes place and make a corresponding entry in the register.

Sec. 3. That no person shall establish or maintain a slaughterhouse or stock yard upon any site not regularly used for that purpose for not less than ninety days immediately preceding the promulgation of these regulations within 300 feet in a straight line of any building wherein people dwell, congregate, or assemble unless or until he has filed with the health officer the consent in writing of the owners and adult occupants of all dwellings within said 300 feet.

Sec. 4. That every owner and every manager of a stock yard, slaughterhouse, or packing house shall cause it to be well lighted and ventilated, and to be paved with some smooth impervious material laid with such grades and channels as may be necessary for effectual and prompt drainage; shall provide a sufficient supply of hot and cold water for the purpose of cleansing, and of supplying the animals confined therein; and shall provide for the prompt disposal in a sanitary manner of all horns, hides, skins, tallow, tripe, blood, by-products, refuse, and condemned material of all kinds, and for the proper care of the carcasses. Every owner and every manager aforesaid shall cause such slaughterhouse, stock yard, or packing house under his control, and the premises connected therewith, to be kept clean and in good repair at all times, and to be operated in accordance with the following regulations:

(a) Ceilings, side walls, pillars, partitions, and other similar parts shall be frequently whitewashed or painted, or, where this is impracticable, they shall, when necessary, be washed, scraped, or otherwise rendered sanitary. Where floors or other parts of a building, or tables or other parts of the equipment, are so old or in such condition that they can not be readily made sanitary, they shall be removed and replaced by suitable materials, or otherwise put into proper condition. All floors upon which meats are piled during the process of curing shall be so constructed that they can be kept in a clean and sanitary condition, and such meats shall also be kept clean.

(b) All trucks, trays, and other receptacles, all chutes, platforms, racks, tables, and other similar devices, and all knives, saws, cleavers, and other tools, and all wagons, utensils, and machinery used in moving, handling, cutting, chopping, mixing, canning, or other process, shall be thoroughly cleansed daily, if used.

(c) The aprons, smocks, or other outer clothing of everyone who handles meat in contact with such clothing, shall be of a material that is readily cleansed and made sanitary, and shall be cleansed daily, if used. Everyone who handles meats or meat food products shall be required to keep his hands clean.

(d) All toilet rooms, urinals, and dressing rooms shall be entirely separated from compartments in which carcasses are dressed or meats or meat food products are cured, stored, packed, handled, or prepared. They shall be sufficient in number, ample in size, and fitted with modern lavatory accommodations, including toilet paper, soap, running water, and towels. They shall be properly lighted, suitably ventilated, and kept in a sanitary condition. Managers of establishments must see that employees keep themselves clean.

(e) The rooms or compartments in which meats or meat food products are prepared, cured, stored, packed, or otherwise handled shall be thoroughly lighted and ventilated and shall be so located that odors from toilet rooms, catch-basins, casing departments, tank rooms, hide cellars, and other similar places do not permeate them. All rooms or compartments shall be provided with cuspidors, which employees who expectorate shall be required to use.

(f) Persons affected with tuberculosis, or any other communicable disease, shall not be knowingly employed in any of the departments of establishments where carcasses are dressed, meats handled, or meat food products prepared, and any employee suspected of being so affected shall be so reported by any inspector visiting the establishment to the manager of the establishment and to the health officer. No person shall dwell or reside in any building used as a slaughterhouse or packing house or in which meat is kept or offered for sale.

(g) The fattening of hogs or other animals on the refuse of slaughterhouses, or the presence of dogs, will not be permitted in or about slaughterhouses and packing houses, and no use incompatible with proper sanitation shall be made of any part of the premises on which such establishment is located. All yards, fences, pens, chutes, alleys, and other similar structures belonging to the premises of such establishment shall, whether they are used or not, be maintained in a sanitary condition.

(h) Butchers who dress diseased carcasses shall cleanse their hands of all grease and then immerse them in a 1 to 1,000 aqueous solution of bichloride of mercury (corrosive sublimate) and rinse them in clear water before engaging again in dressing or handling healthy carcasses. All butchers' implements used in dressing diseased carcasses shall be cleansed of all grease and then sterilized, either in boiling water or by immersion in a prescribed disinfectant, and rinsed in clear water before being again used in dressing healthy carcasses.

Proper facilities for such cleansing and disinfection shall be provided by the establishment. Separate trucks and other devices shall be furnished for handling diseased carcasses and parts. Following the slaughter of an animal affected with an infectious disease, a stop shall be made until the implements have been cleansed and disinfected unless duplicate implements are provided.

(i) Inspectors are required to furnish their own knives for use in

dissecting or incising diseased carcasses or parts, and are required to use the same means for disinfecting knives, hands, etc., as are prescribed for employees of the establishment.

(j) Meats and meat-food products intended for rendering into edible products must be prevented from falling on the floor while being emptied into the tanks by the use of some device, such as a metal funnel.

(k) All carcasses, heads, untrimmed lungs with liver attached, spleens, and tongues of animals not killed in the presence of an inspector in the service of the health department shall be hung on racks provided for that purpose immediately after slaughtering, and shall remain there if the slaughtering be done after midnight and before noon until 6 o'clock p. m. of the same day, and if the slaughtering be done after noon and before midnight until noon of the following day, unless sooner examined by an inspector aforesaid. All such carcasses and organs shall be marked by the person placing them on the racks hereinbefore provided for in such manner that such organs can be positively identified with the carcass from which they have been removed.

(l) At least 1 inch of the diaphragm of every slaughtered animal shall be left on each animal until an inspector shall have examined, inspected, and passed the same (save in the case of cattle, in which at least 6 inches of said diaphragm shall be left on each animal), and the parietal pleura, or lining of the chest cavity, and the parietal peritoneum, or lining of the abdominal cavity, ordinarily removed in the process known as "stripping," shall remain upon each carcass.

SEC. 5. That no owner and no manager of a slaughterhouse shall slaughter or permit to be slaughtered therein any cattle, sheep, swine, calf, or goat except between the hours of sunrise and sunset unless he has been authorized so to do by the health officer, nor otherwise than in accordance with such authorization.

SEC. 6. That every owner and every manager of a slaughterhouse that is not regularly and continuously used for slaughtering shall fix certain days, and shall fix, and so far as is practicable limit the hours for slaughtering in such slaughterhouse, and shall file with the health officer a statement showing such days and hours, and no owner or manager of any such slaughterhouse shall slaughter or permit to be slaughtered therein any cattle, sheep, swine, calf, or goat, except on the days and between the hours so specified unless he has filed with the health officer, not less than twenty-four hours prior thereto, a notice of his intention, and desire so to do and of the hours when such slaughtering is to be done.

SEC. 7. That upon each carcass inspected and passed by an inspector in the service of the health department there shall be placed at the time of inspection labels or marks bearing the registration number of the slaughterhouse and the words "D. C. Inspected and passed," as follows: Upon each dressed beef carcass at least ten labels or marks, and upon each dressed carcass of a calf, sheep, swine, or goat, at least two.

SEC. 8. That each carcass or part of carcass inspected and condemned by an inspector in the service of the health department shall be so anointed or injected with kerosene as effectually to prevent its sale.

SEC. 9. That except in so far as relates to location and registration, these regulations shall not apply to stock yards, slaughterhouses, and packing houses, in which, under inspection by the Federal Government, animals are kept and slaughtered, and in which meat products are prepared for interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 10. That any person violating the provisions of these regulations shall be punished, upon conviction thereof, by a fine not exceeding \$200.

SEC. 11. That this act shall take effect from and after the expiration of two months immediately following the approval thereof.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. From aught that appears from hearing the bill read it would seem the bill repeals, as far as the District of Columbia is concerned, to a large extent the meat-inspection law, if not the pure-food law. I suppose, of course, it is not the intention of the bill, but is not all of this controlled by the meat-inspection law which we passed last session in the agricultural appropriation act?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I am informed that the meat-inspection law which was passed at the last session does not cover the District of Columbia, and for that reason it is sought to read that act into the District of Columbia Code. The report of this bill was made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], a member of the committee, and I will yield time to him to explain its contents and purport.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is not to repeal the meat-inspection law nor the pure-food law. On the contrary, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the people of the District of Columbia as pure food and meat, as free from disease as can be had in any other section of the country, under the law passed at the last session of this Congress. Prior to the enactment of the Federal meat-inspection law live stock killed in adjacent States was brought in here without provision for inspection. At that time there was no provision for inspecting meats here in the District. To-day animals that would not stand the test if killed in slaughterhouses in Maryland or Virginia, under the meat-inspection law passed at the last session, may be brought into the District of Columbia and slaughtered here in slaughterhouses without passing such a rigid inspection as is necessary for the protection of the public against diseased meat. And the purpose of this bill is to protect the people of the District from having animals brought in from adjoining States and slaughtered here in evasion of the meat-inspection law of the last Congress. Meat killed in the District of Columbia for consumption here is not covered by the meat-inspection law nor the pure-food law of the last Congress.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. At least that seems to be the opinion of the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia and of the Commissioners.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken, I think, in reference to the opinion of the corporation counsel. The pure-food law, so far as it covers the subject at all—of course it does not cover the subject of slaughtering of animals—covers everything in the District of Columbia, and the corporation counsel does not say otherwise. I think the gentleman is correct about the examination of the meat-inspection law, that through an inadvertence provision in reference to the District of Columbia only apply to meats that go outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Or shipped in. And the purpose of this bill is to read the meat-inspection law into the laws of the District of Columbia for the government of the inspection of animals slaughtered for consumption here.

Mr. MANN. I remember that when the pure-food law was enacted the Commissioners of the District of Columbia were very strongly opposed to including the District of Columbia in the territory embraced in that law; and I was a little bit suspicious that they might now be seeking to get out from under the operation of that law.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I hope the suspicion of the gentleman from Illinois has been allayed.

Mr. MANN. They are perfectly allayed by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question; yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to call his attention to the provision on page 5, as follows:

No person shall dwell or reside in any building used as a slaughterhouse or packing house or in which meat is kept or offered for sale.

In this District, as in other cities, there are a number of butcher stores and buildings parts of which are used for residential purposes by persons not very well to do. This provision will make it utterly impossible—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. To what line does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] refer?

Mr. FITZGERALD. To lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, on page 5. That language makes it utterly impossible to maintain a butcher store for the sale of meat in any building in which there are tenants.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. This only provides that slaughterhouses and packing houses—

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provision says that "no person shall dwell or reside in any building used as slaughter house or packing house or in which—"

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the "or" should be stricken out.

Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, to strike out the word "or," following the word "house," in line 13, on page 5.

Mr. MANN. That is, the gentleman strikes out the word "or," after the word "house," in line 13?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 13, strike out the word "or;" so that the sentence will read:

"No person shall dwell or reside in any building used as a slaughterhouse or packing house in which meat is kept or offered for sale."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the gentleman's attention to one feature of this bill. It may be right and it may not. The bill prohibits an owner of a pig even from slaughtering the pig upon his own premises for his own personal use. The first section of the bill provides that no animal intended for food shall be slaughtered anywhere in the District of Columbia except in a registered slaughterhouse. Was it the intention of the committee to prevent one living in the suburbs of the city, in the outskirts, but still in the District of Columbia, one who runs a small truck farm and who may raise a few pigs or calves—is it the intention of the committee to make it unlawful for him to slaughter an animal so raised for his own private use?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana I will say that it is not the intention of the law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Read the first section.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I call the gentleman's attention to line 12 on the first page of the bill. He will notice that the reading there is: "Where such meat products are for sale."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But, if the gentleman pleases, he is referring to another thing. Read the first section. It makes it unqualifiedly unlawful for any person to slaughter any animal

for purposes of food except in a regularly registered slaughterhouse. Nothing can be plainer. I have no doubt the bill does make it unlawful for a man to slaughter an animal anywhere else except in a slaughterhouse. No person who might raise a pig for family use upon his little peasant farm could slaughter the pig at home. This would compel him to carry it to a slaughterhouse to have it slaughtered. The first section of the bill, standing alone, declares that unequivocally, and it is not open to construction.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish the gentleman from Indiana would call attention to that part of the clause.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I do not care to refer to that clause; but the first section is unequivocal, and is not open to construction.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish the gentleman would call attention to that portion of the first section of the bill which prohibits one from killing an animal upon his own premises for his own use.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman read the first section?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The first section provides:

That no person shall slaughter for food any cattle, sheep, swine, calf, or goat elsewhere than in a registered slaughterhouse.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. For food. No person may slaughter a pig in his own barnyard or pigpen for food. That is what the first section provides. There is no doubt about its meaning. I do not see how it can mean anything else. If the gentleman would put in, after the word "food," "for purposes of sale" it would remedy the matter. I do not think it is the intention and policy of the committee to compel people who raise pigs in the suburbs of the city to drive them to a slaughterhouse to have them slaughtered.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will say that I am not sure that would not be a good provision. I think swine fed in back yards in the District of Columbia or in any other city of its size ought not to be slaughtered for food without being first inspected to see whether they are diseased and suitable for food, whether they are intended for use or for sale.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is not the provision. The provision says they must be slaughtered at a registered slaughterhouse.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Where there is provision made for the inspection of the meat to see if it is free from disease.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I suggest, after the word "food," in the first section, there be inserted the words "for purposes of sale."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have no objection.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I suggest that as an amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish to offer an amendment, so as to make it read: "That no person shall slaughter for purposes of sale."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That will do.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 3, page 1, strike out the word "food" and insert "for purposes of sale."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF THE STREETS OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 14897, which is on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up a bill the title of which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14897) providing for the temporary maintenance of the Long Bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is unfinished business, as the Chair understands.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, in reference to this bill, that the Long Bridge is now being demolished and that part of the bill is unnecessary to consider, and I desire to offer a substitute for the whole bill that I think is satisfactory to all concerned.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute. The gentleman moves to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That from and after the 1st day of January, 1908, every wagon or other vehicle of whatsoever kind or description, weighing when loaded more than 5,000 pounds, used, operated, or propelled on, over, or across any of the streets, avenues, alleys, bridges, or roadways of the

District of Columbia, shall have wheel tires not less than 4 inches broad. Any owner or driver or other person in control of such wagon or other vehicle so using, operating, or propelling the same who shall violate the provisions of this section shall, on conviction thereof in the police court of the District of Columbia, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$25, or by imprisonment for not more than sixty days, or both."

Amend the title to read: "A bill to protect the streets of the city of Washington."

Mr. MUDD. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MUDD. I did not quite hear the substitute as read in its entirety. I understand, however, that it provides that it shall take effect January 1, 1908.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. And it makes the weight of wagons as loaded 5,000 pounds instead of 2 tons, above which the requirement as to broad tires is to take effect?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the substitute will be considered as agreed to, and the bill as amended will be considered as engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Chair is asking for unanimous consent for the passage of the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was under the impression that there was no objection to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; there is very serious objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute in lieu of the bill—that is, the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand the substitute, it is the same provision of law, except that it postpones the date for it to go into operation. Is that correct?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; it increases the amount of the load to 5,000 pounds. The bill originally provided for 4,000 pounds. This increases it to 5,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And says that all wagons carrying that load shall have these broad tires.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; more than 5,000.

Mr. MUDD. May I suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that I take it for granted that all those who were opposed to the original bill will at least be glad to have it amended by the adoption of this substitute, which makes it less oppressive than it was before. For myself I want to say—

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if we pass the substitute, the substitute becomes a law as far as the House is concerned.

Mr. MUDD. I apprehend that all of us will agree to the substitute as an amendment to the original bill. The substitute makes it better than it was before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we could act on this as an amendment to the provision and afterwards could vote down the provision as amended, that would be a different proposition, but you are offering it as a substitute, and when you vote it up it is up for good.

Mr. MUDD. No; after voting to adopt the substitute we can vote down the bill as amended by the substitute. I am frank to say that by the adoption of the substitute the bill will become fairly satisfactory to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not satisfactory to me, and I do not think it will be satisfactory to the farmers of Maryland and Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The situation is this: If the substitute offered by way of amendment is agreed to, that does not pass the bill, but that question will have to be taken afterwards.

Mr. MUDD. No; we can adopt this substitute at all events.

The SPEAKER. The question would come up afterwards on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out the word "five" where it occurs and insert the word "four."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa offers the following amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3 of the substitute strike out the word "five" and insert the word "four;" so that it will read "more than 4,000 pounds."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this amendment ought to meet the approval of the Members of this House. Our streets here are bad enough at best. This is in the direction of their protection. Look at the matter practically. Here is a tire that is of ordinary width, 2 inches. After that is worn a little—it wears first at the edges—it has a rounded surface and the bearing point upon the pavement is exceedingly narrow, perhaps not an inch wide. It is a gross outrage to allow 4,000 pounds on four bearing points on our streets that are not more than an inch in width, and at most 2 or 3 inches in length. The destruction is very great, and it ought not to be permitted. Especially is that true in very warm weather. When the as-

phaltum pavement is softened you will see that the marks of very heavily laden wagons are easily to be discerned for a distance of several rods. That ought not to be. It will be a simple matter to change the tires of these very heavy wagons to 4 or 5 inches, and I think the House ought to see to it in the protection of the streets that this is done in order that we may have what we ought to have in this city, model streets. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows of any city which has such a requirement as he proposes?

Mr. HEPBURN. I don't know whether any other city has it or not, but I think I know that the city of Washington ought to have it: Those who oppose this amendment, Mr. Speaker, are doing it in the interest of very few people. They are the brick haulers from across into Virginia and the coal dealers. They are almost the only ones who are objecting to this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. To either one, or both.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I just want to say to the gentleman that the Business Men's Association—without exception, every business man in the city—is opposed to it.

Mr. HEPBURN. If they are, then I have no respect whatever for the judgment of the business men of the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I want to say another thing to the gentleman. As I understand this bill it has never been referred to the District Commissioners; they have never been asked, as is usually the case, for their opinion upon this measure.

Mr. HEPBURN. I don't know whether that is true or not, and I am not sure that it is absolutely necessary that we should have their opinion. This is a matter upon which men can form their own judgments. We do not have to ask an expert. Those people who are as familiar with the streets of the city as is the gentleman from Virginia know that a heavily loaded wagon, especially one with an old wagon tire, is a menace to the streets of this town, and it ought not to be permitted. I do not think there are 200 vehicles which belong to the people of the city of Washington that will be affected by this legislation, and as to those 200 it is important that the tires upon them should be corrected.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I wish to state to the gentleman that the District Committee had a hearing for the people representing these interests, and they failed to convince us that there was any hardship.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words with reference to this bill, as I have given the subject a good deal of time and attention. When the statement is made here that the business men of Washington are opposed to this as a whole, that is an error. The business men, or a large number of them in the city of Washington, have appealed to me within the last week to pass this bill before Congress adjourns. Now, this committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, requested the police department to examine every heavily laden wagon that came in from the country, from Virginia and Maryland, to the markets—these large loads of hay and produce where they use four horses. In only one single instance, in an inspection covering thirty days, was there one heavily laden wagon with a tire of less than four inches. There was only one wagon found in thirty days that carried over 4,000 pounds or 4,500 which had less than a 4-inch tire. It is absolutely necessary in the country to use a wide tire to protect the roads and keep the wagons from going down through them. So that it does not affect that interest at all. I will tell you the interest that it does affect. It affects the draymen and the truckmen from Alexandria and the brick dealers from Virginia, and, by the way, the president of the largest brick manufacturing plant said to me, "I heartily indorse the bill, and every wagon we use I shall guarantee will have a 4-inch tire; we ought to have it for our own convenience, as well as for the preservation of the streets."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the gentleman goes on, I should ask the gentleman if he has heard from the mill men in Washington—the flour mill men?

Mr. BABCOCK. Why, I have heard from them in connection with the draymen of Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They make protests; in fact, the protests are chiefly from the mill men.

Mr. BABCOCK. If I neglected to state it, I will state it also

comes from the express companies and these parties here doing heavy hauling. Now, I want to give the gentleman an instance of that which occurred last week and was reported to me by a representative gentleman here, Mr. C. C. Glover, who stated he had occasion to drive out Massachusetts avenue last week and followed a wagon that had a heavy load, consisting of a very large piece of stone which the wagon was taking out to the university. They went down Massachusetts avenue, and after they reached the macadamized street the wagon sank down to the depth of 8 inches in the street, and they had to drive diagonally across the street, and as it went on farther the wagon settled to the hub in an improved street, in a macadamized street, where they had to abandon the wagon and take the four horses away. Now, that is one instance that occurred last week. Now, the Committee on Appropriations, or this Congress, has provided for the resurfacing of Pennsylvania avenue, and I want to say to this House that if you permit these loads of 4, 5, and 6 tons on 2½-inch tires to traverse the streets, you will have to resurface it again in two or three years. It costs the District of Columbia an immense amount of money and when one of these heavy loads is on a narrow tire it makes an abrasion in the street and the next wagon makes it deeper, and the next makes it deeper, until you find the street full of holes, as it is now. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the use of 2½-inch tires will cost the District of Columbia \$200,000 a year. There is no reason on God's earth why these wagons should not have 4-inch tires that will support these heavy loads. It is the first little abrasion that does the harm, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, it is only those who are directly interested, only those who are using 2½-inch tires that have come before us and opposed this legislation. I consider it absolutely necessary as a measure of economy. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we had better appropriate money to-day to buy 4-inch tires for every dray in the city of Washington rather than to permit them to go on using 2 and 2½ inch tires. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's argument is tolerably sound if the premise was at all sound. Since this matter was up the last time I have walked over a great many of the asphalt streets of Washington with a view of seeing whether these very statements of facts are well founded or not. The gentleman has stated that the streets are torn up by these wheels. I at this time state that where the breaks in the asphalt occur they occur in the other direction. Now, I have walked down Pennsylvania avenue, Massachusetts avenue, Connecticut avenue, and Fourteenth street, and there is not a single instance of a cut in the street in the direction of the street made by a narrow tire, and the gentleman can not find one. The breaks that are in the asphalt when they occur are, as a rule, perpendicular to the line of the street, and are made by the changes in temperature or by the fact that the asphalt was not well laid down. Pennsylvania avenue is in holes everywhere right now, but it is not in cuts, it is not in ruts; it is in holes, and those holes, as a rule, are due to the fact that when that pavement was made there was not a sufficient foundation under the pavement. It was not properly built. If you are going to resurface Pennsylvania avenue, you will do a very good work.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit? Has he heard the report made by the bicycle policemen on Pennsylvania avenue, that the destruction of the surface of the street there was caused by the heaviness of the loads and the narrowness of the tires?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not, and I do not care. I invite the Members of this House to walk this evening down Pennsylvania avenue to the Treasury, and they will find that what I have said is absolutely the fact. I do not care who makes a report. There is not a single rut in the asphalt parallel with the sidewalk as it would be if made by wagons. What holes are in the asphalt are holes on the transverse, and that is owing to the effect on the character of the asphalt by change of temperature. One would naturally conclude that the contraction and the expansion would be better taken care of parallel with the sidewalk, because the distance is so much greater when there is an upheaval, whereas between curb and curb the weather does cause a break in the surface from undue expansion at one time and contraction at another. These people who have been protesting to me, at any rate, were men like Mr. McDowell, of the great flour mill down here—principally the mill men.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is right. They protest against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it was not simply the brick men over in Alexandria or somewhere else.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard some one say a few moments ago that there was no other city in the United States that had a wide-tire ordinance. I did not suppose that there was any city in the United States that had any decent streets that did not have a wide-tire ordinance. I know there has been one in my own town for years, and I know that there are such in a good many other towns.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] seems to think that he has demonstrated the case because he can not find a rut running the whole length of Pennsylvania avenue or a good portion of it. Why, the gentleman totally misapprehends the way the streets get out of repair. It is not by narrow tires cutting through the asphalt down to the foundation and running from one end of the street to the other or running any particular length. The asphalt gets soft in places; the narrow tire comes in and depresses it a little bit, perhaps the next one a little more, and then the water settles there. Under the action of the water it finally affects the asphalt and produces these holes we find in the pavements of the streets, and, of course, you would not find a rut, running in the direction of the street, gouged out by a tire. It is the effect of the water after the tire has made the depression. Every expert in road building in the United States will tell the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that a narrow tire destroys the roadway. I do not care whether it is asphalt pavement or whether it is macadam or whether it is a gravel road, it is the narrow tire that does the business. It takes but a little at a time, and the water sets in, and the water standing in the roadway is what finally eats out the roadway. It softens it, and then the wagons come over it with narrow tires, and even wider tires, and it constantly wears out the whole of the street, and we have as a consequence what we see in Pennsylvania avenue and Massachusetts avenue and almost every other avenue and street in the city of Washington. And it seems to me a very mild proposition to say that wagons that carry two tons should be required to have broad tires.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that heavy wagons are forbidden to drive through the grounds around the Capitol here, and if it is not a fact that the pavement around here where heavy wagons are kept off is in worse condition than in those parts of the city where these heavy wagons come?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not found it so, because I have found the worst pavements on the streets that I generally travel, and those are the most generally traveled streets.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact that the history of all pavements shows that where there is no traffic at all on the streets the pavements wear out quicker than where there is traffic on the streets?

Mr. PAYNE. I had not discovered that.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the fact.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not believe it is the fact.

Mr. MADDEN. It is the fact.

Mr. PAYNE. It can not be possible, if they are properly made in the first place. Without talking any further upon the proposition, because on its face it is an absurd proposition—

Mr. MADDEN. Nevertheless it is true.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, if it is true, then the more narrow tires go over the street the more you improve it. The gentleman from Illinois can hardly pursue such a proposition as that. I hope this amendment will be adopted, and the bill will pass.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BABCOCK. What time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Ten minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement of the gentleman from New York, who has just taken his seat, I want to read from a statement made by a gentleman who is an expert and who, therefore, knows something about laying pavements and who is capable of speaking as to their durability. I read from an account of a meeting held in this city last year, reported in the Evening Star. This meeting of business men was held for the purpose of protesting against this very measure, and at that meeting Mr. P. J. Brennan gave expert testimony as to the use of narrow tires upon asphalt pavements. It seems to me that the opinion of such a witness is entitled to much weight. I read from the Evening Star report:

Mr. P. J. Brennan, president of the Brennan Construction Company, which has laid a large portion of the asphalt pavements in this city, stated that his company lays these pavements under contract, which makes them liable for the good condition of the pavements for five

years, and they have to give bond that they will correct any defect in the pavements occurring in that time. But he would prefer having tires of diversified sizes rather than tires of 4 inches. He did not consider that a 2-inch tire would be any more harmful than a 4-inch tire. What the pavements really suffer from, he said, is the lack of travel. An asphalt pavement that is not sufficiently traveled, he said, will be in worse condition than one that is greatly traveled by teams carrying tires of different widths.

As against the mere opinions of gentlemen who do not pretend to any special knowledge upon subjects of this character I submit the opinion of one who not only has had large experience in putting down asphalt pavements in this city, but who also has a personal and direct interest in their preservation. Being under bond to repair such damages as may be sustained by the pavements from their use by heavy wagons, his opinion is surely entitled to the very highest credit.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes; for a question.

Mr. PAYNE. Considering the fact that the more the pavement is worn out the more there would be to be laid, his motives or interest drew him in the other direction as well as in the direction of the testimony on your side of the question.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I further—

Mr. PAYNE. One further question. This I understand was a meeting of the business men here, the men who wanted these narrow-tired wagons?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I hope this interruption does not come out of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. I say that the meeting was one called by these business men to protest against the passage of this law.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I stated that. And now I want to say that this gentleman further stated that the asphalt pavements which are little used suffer more from that cause than do those which are in constant use.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to say, in reference to that gentleman, that he convinced himself before the committee that the 2-inch tires were better than the 4, and also that if the asphalt, if it was not used at all, would at once disintegrate and be of no use. He said that 1½-inch was better than 4-inch for the wagons used in the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement made by another gentleman, that the people who objected to this 4-inch tire were only Virginians engaged in hauling brick from Virginia to this city, I want to read this communication addressed to my colleague [Mr. RIXEY], who represents the district in Virginia adjacent to this city:

MARCH 9, 1906.

HON. JOHN F. RIXEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a largely attended meeting of the board of directors of the Business Men's Association, held March 8, House bill No. 14897 came up before the board and was thoroughly discussed; and on motion of Mr. W. S. Knox, duly seconded by Mr. P. Brennan, it was resolved that the association go on record as being unalterably opposed to the third section of said bill, it being agreed that the adoption of said section would work an unnecessary hardship and unwarranted expense to the owners and users of teams hauling 2 tons or more. It was further agreed that the association use its good offices and every honorable means to defeat said legislation in becoming a law.

Very truly, yours,

JAS. F. OYSTER, President.
WM. F. GUDE, Secretary.

These gentlemen, representing the Business Men's Association of this city, not people engaged in hauling brick from Virginia to the city of Washington, have gone on record as being unalterably opposed to this legislation. Naturally the people of Virginia and Maryland who haul their products to this city in heavy wagons are opposed to this proposed legislation, but they are not alone in their opposition.

The manufacturers of brick in Virginia who send their bricks here in heavy wagons, the farmers whose market wagons come, as well as the business men of this city who will be affected by this proposed legislation are all opposed to it. They oppose it because it will entail upon them heavy and, as I believe, needless expense. Upon many farmers it will be a real hardship.

Why has not this measure been referred to the Commissioners for the District of Columbia? Such, I am told, has been the invariable course in all matters of legislation of this character. Had that course been pursued in this case this House would have now before it facts which are now wanting—facts which would doubtless convince every mind here that this measure ought not to pass this House.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House will be safer in accepting the testimony of the business men of this city and the experts who have given opinions in reference to this matter than in accepting those of my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. I agree with what has been said by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], for I have but recently carefully observed the streets of Washington, and I have failed to find any evidence of

injury to the asphalt pavements resulting from the use of narrow tires. The sun has caused far more injury to pavements than narrow tires. The slightest examination of the asphalt pavement along the east front of this Capitol building, where the use of light vehicles is only permitted, and the same pavements near the Long Bridge, over which heavy wagons, with narrow tires, pass, will, I think, clearly demonstrate the correctness of the position taken by the business men of this city. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], that I have here the statements of the mayors of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and of Richmond, all to the effect that there is no requirement in those cities with reference to the use of wide or narrow tires. I should have said that in Richmond heavy wagons are not permitted to use tires less than two and a half inches in width. In the other two cities named there is absolutely no requirement on the subject. I imagine that the streets in the city of Philadelphia, where narrow tires are permitted, are in just as good condition as are those in the city which my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has the honor to represent.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I ask the gentleman a question? Mr. JONES of Virginia. You may.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What does the gentleman from Virginia think is the effect of these narrow tires, and the hauling of brick across the river on the Long Bridge and the approaches to the bridge, where the surface is not asphalt? What is the effect of the narrow tires there as compared with the wide ones?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I do not know whether there is asphalt on the bridge or not. I rather think there is.

Mr. BABCOCK. On the bridge, but not on the approaches.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. On all of those places which are not covered with asphalt, what is the effect?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I have not examined the bridge, but I understand this to be the case, that when the movement in favor of wide tires was first inaugurated, it was because of the fact that the approaches to the bridge had been but recently paved. The bridge had been recently built, and the idea was that inasmuch as the roadbeds had not settled, the use of these narrow tires might be injurious. Now that the roadbeds have thoroughly settled, as I imagine is the case, there can be little excuse for the passage of this measure.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What about the macadamized approaches?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I am speaking of the asphalt pavements. I know nothing about the macadamized roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I mean streets that are not paved with asphalt. What is the effect of the narrow tire as compared with the wide one upon them?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I should think that on dirt roads, or such roads as the gentleman appears to have in mind, wide tires would be better than narrow ones; but I think all the testimony goes to show, and as far as my observation goes it confirms that testimony, that narrow tires have not injured the streets of Washington any more than wide ones have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I can corroborate the statement of the gentlemen from Mississippi as to the appearance of the surface of the streets. It is true that there seem to be breaks in the streets lengthwise, crosswise, and every other way. Evidently they are not caused by tires or the lack of tires; but this law applies to the whole District of Columbia, and the streets of the District are not all paved with asphalt. It does seem to me that asphalt paving is such a peculiar thing that it is difficult to judge it by comparison with anything except itself. But upon the idea of the gentleman from New York or some other gentlemen who have spoken on this matter, in many cases the bed work or foundation upon which the asphalt is laid is defective. If there is a defect beneath the surface of the asphalt, it may be small; it may be crosswise or lengthwise with the street. It is perfectly natural that a great weight upon a narrow tire would come nearer to breaking it than if it was a broad surface, upon the same principle that you can walk on snow with snowshoes when you could not with skates. Now, it does seem to me that 5,000 pounds is so large a load that most of the hauling that will be made with tires less than 4 inches wide will not exceed that weight anyway, and that there can not be any very great hardship in requiring persons who haul over 5,000 pounds, including the weight of their wagon, to adopt the wide tire.

Certainly nobody will contend that a 4-inch tire will hurt the pavement or injure the surface of it or be more injurious than the narrow tire. It does seem to me that this is a reasonable

proposition, and that we will get rid of this question by adopting the substitute, making it 5,000 pounds instead of 4,000, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa; and the time of the going into effect of the law being postponed until next January, those who have narrow tires and heavy draft wagons will have plenty of time in which to change their tires or wheels without any great loss to them. As the law is now you can put 10 tons onto a wagon with narrow tires, if you can get that weight onto the wagon.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; and they had 10 tons on a 2½-inch tire, and the last I knew of it the wagon stood in the middle of the street down to its hubs.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly it will not be easier to overload a broad-tired wagon so as to injure the surface of the street than it would be to overload a narrow-tired wagon to the same extent. I do not think there is any great hardship in this bill as amended. Gentlemen who own wagons have talked with me and discussed this matter a great deal, and, of course, they do not want to have to change their tires. But I believe, from a fair investigation, having studied the matter since last winter, taking the District as a whole and knowing it is not all paved with asphalt and never will be, and that wagons come in here from the States, we ought to adopt some reasonable measure. I believe to require a 4-inch tire for 5,000 pounds is not unreasonable or a hardship, and that we had better adopt the substitute and be done with the matter.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL].

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made here a few minutes since that the use of wide tires for heavy wagons is not required in other cities, I wish to state a little experience or observation on the subject. I live in Syracuse, N. Y. Some years ago our streets were in very bad condition, largely made so by the hauling over them of heavy loads in narrow-tired wagons. There are several small quarries outside of our city some 4 or 5 miles, and the heavily laden stone wagons were drawn into the city and through its streets. Those wagons were then equipped with narrow tires, and were cutting up the streets so that it was impossible to keep them in good condition. An ordinance was passed by the common council of our city during the mayoralty of Mr. Belden, my predecessor in this House. Many of the people who had been accustomed to use narrow tires objected strenuously to that ordinance, and claimed that it was unconstitutional. They took the matter to the courts, in which it was held that the ordinance was valid. Wide tires were then required to be put on those heavy stone wagons, and since then on all heavy wagons. Since that time our streets have been improved, largely because they have not been cut up so badly by narrow-tired, heavily laden wagons. It is manifest that on a dirt or a macadam or any kind of a soft road a wide tire is better than a narrow one. It acts as a sort of roller, while a narrow one cuts down into the street and tears it up. It is admitted here that the wide tire is better than the narrow one for macadam and dirt roads and all sorts of roads except asphalt or other pavement. The narrow tire may not damage the asphalt very much in winter or in cold weather when the material is hard, but in summer when it is soft the narrow tire does cut the pavement.

We have all seen the time in this city when the horses going along the streets in midsummer, when the pavement is almost steaming, that the calks of the horses and also the narrow tires of wagons cut into the asphalt. Also in winter narrow tires do more damage to asphalt pavement than do wide tires. Holes or depressions may be made in the asphalt by many causes, and after a hole or depression is once made down to the concrete then certainly the narrow tire injures it more than does the wide tire. In cold weather the asphalt is pretty hard and brittle, and when it breaks off it breaks off in chunks, and when the wagon wheel comes along and strikes it it breaks off a little. Now, a narrow tire of the same weight, force, and speed striking against the edge of the pavement does more damage than a wide tire. Common observation and experience with familiar things lead to that conclusion. I suppose that in nearly all the well-regulated cities of the country wide-tire ordinances for heavily laden wagons are in existence and also enforced, and Washington should not be an exception to other well-regulated and progressive cities. This is a beautiful city. It is pretty well kept and is very expensive. It is not much of a hardship to require men using heavily loaded wagons to do their part toward keeping the streets in order. They ought to do that of their own free will, by reason of their civic pride and desire to have the city look as beautiful as possible; and if they are not so disposed, they should be compelled to do so. And the committee is right in requiring that men drawing heavy

loads over the streets of our city be compelled to do their part toward preserving the good condition of our streets, even at a little extra expense to them.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING].

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was long ago conceded that broad tires were the best conservators of roads that can be had. Certain it is that in towns in Massachusetts with which I am familiar, where they have used broad tires, they have reduced the cost of care and maintenance of the roads from 30 to 40 per cent. Of this I can bring proof. It is a well-known fact that in Europe on toll roads the tolls are graded according to the width of the tires, and they even go to the extent of not demanding toll from wagons which have tires 4 or 5 inches in width. I hope this amendment will be adopted here. I believe in fixing the limit at 4,000 rather than 5,000 pounds. I think if it is adopted here it will be followed by State legislatures enacting similar legislation throughout the country, and for that reason, among others, as an example we ought to adopt it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Munn) there were—ayes 113, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move to amend the bill—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BABCOCK. Not for an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield for the purposes of offering an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to the gentleman. My amendment is simply to provide that this should be for the load without the wagon. The wagon will weigh 4,000 pounds in some instances. I appeal to the gentleman to permit me to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to offer the amendment unless the gentleman from Wisconsin demands the previous question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, with the number of bills we have I shall have to ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands the previous question on the substitute to the bill to its final passage.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-two gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I demand the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Those in favor of the yeas and nays are 32 and those opposed are 134.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-eight gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The question is on the substitute.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 137, noes 44.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-one gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused, and the amendment is agreed to. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The ayes have it, and the bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to protect the streets of the city of Washington."

RETENT ON CONTRACTS WITH THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill (H. R. 21684) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906, be, and the same is hereby, amended so that it shall read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That this act shall cover and comprehend all contracts for the construction of bridges, sewers, buildings, and other contracts for construction work, as herein specified, which are now completed or which may hereafter be completed by the contractors according to their contracts and accepted by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SERVICE ON FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17170) to amend an act relating to service on foreign corporations, approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,'"

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"When a foreign corporation shall transact business in the District without having any place of business or resident agent therein, service upon any officer or agent or employee of such corporation in the District shall be effectual as to suits growing out of contracts entered into or to be performed, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia or growing out of any tort heretofore or hereafter committed in the said District."

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the second paragraph of section 1537 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, amended so that it shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to make a statement to the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the House that inasmuch as it was expected by a large number of the membership of the House to-day that the urgent deficiency bill, which lately passed the House and was amended in the Senate, carrying a loan of \$1,000,000 to the Jamestown Exposition Company, was to come up to-day, by agreement has been postponed until to-morrow morning, and will be brought up to-morrow morning. I promised on behalf of all parties interested to give this notice to the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope people will stay here, notwithstanding.

CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill (S. 6338) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved March 16, 1896, entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the said corporation shall have full power and authority to take and hold subscriptions, contributions, donations, grants, devises, or bequests, in money, real estate, or otherwise, which heretofore have been made or which may hereafter be made for the purpose of an Episcopal residence, diocesan house, church colleges, church or parish schools, churches, or mission chapels, and for the purpose of creating a permanent fund or endowment for the support of the episcopate in said diocese, and to or in behalf of religious, missionary, charitable, or educational agencies' uses or purposes now existing or hereafter to exist, under the jurisdiction, control, or sanction of said convention within the limits of said diocese, the annual income from which shall not exceed \$100,000, and the same to invest and the proceeds thereof to apply for the purposes aforesaid as may from time to time be deemed most expedient, and to appoint, in its discretion, an executive committee or other trustees, boards, or agencies, by whatsoever name or names they may be designated, to administer such funds or property in such manner and form and with such authority as the

said corporation shall from time to time prescribe: *Provided, however, and always*, That in such administration the respective funds shall be kept distinct and separate; that each fund shall be held liable only for obligations that may have been incurred in its own proper behoof; and that the principal sum or amount of such subscriptions, contributions, donations, grants, devises, and bequests for permanent endowment of the episcopate shall be at all time invested in some safe and profitable stocks, real estate within the limits of the said diocese, mortgages, deeds of trust, or other securities, and the expenses of administering the same, the salary of the bishop, and other charges shall be payable and paid only out of the annual interest, dividends, or profits thereof: *And provided further*, That unless this amendment shall be accepted by resolution of the convention of the said diocese at its next annual meeting, and a copy of such resolution of acceptance, certified by the secretary of the convention, be filed for record with the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia within sixty days thereafter, the same shall become void and of no effect."

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

On page 2 strike out all commencing with the word "some," in line 22, down to and including the word "securities," in line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"bonds of the United States or of the District of Columbia, in first-class State or municipal securities; in first mortgages or first deeds of trust on real estate not exceeding 60 per cent of the value of such real estate, or in the first mortgage bonds of any railroad corporation which has for five consecutive years immediately preceding such investment paid dividends on its common stock."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to offer a suggestion or two and an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] yield?

Mr. OLCOTT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill provides for the amendment of an act incorporating the Protestant Episcopal Church, and it authorizes the church organization to receive bequests, donations, and devises of personal and real property and authorizes the property to be invested for ecclesiastical, educational, missionary, and charitable purposes, and there is no limit at all on the amount of the real estate the corporation may hold in the aggregate. I do not believe it is a wise policy to create a corporation of any kind without some limitation on the amount of the real estate it may own. I made an objection to a bill a day or two ago on that ground. The amendment I propose to offer limits the amount of real estate which this corporation may own at any one time to an aggregate of \$2,000,000. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. OLCOTT. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the entire property, both real and personal, can not have an income of more than \$100,000, and the corporation is only allowed to take real estate which is devised to them by will. We have stricken out the clause in the bill allowing them to invest in real estate, and have made a change which we believe in the line of conservatism, to prevent investing in real estate. They can take real estate by devise, the income of which added to the income of all their personal property does not exceed \$100,000. It seems to me that limitation is sufficient.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I noticed that provision in the bill, and I had some doubt—

Mr. OLCOTT. Will the gentleman excuse me for a moment? That limitation now exists in the present law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What is the object of the amendment?

Mr. OLCOTT. The object of this amendment is that the corporation was not allowed, and it is not allowed under the present law, to take devises of real estate. Now, wills have been made, and the corporation is now entitled under the terms of those wills to take a certain devise in real estate. It wishes authority to receive it. That is the main object.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There are a number of objections that I have to this kind of legislation. This corporation might possibly be the beneficiary of large bequests and devises and hold real estate without limit. Nobody knows what the future may bring.

Mr. OLCOTT. Except the limitation is that the income from personal property and all of its real property shall not exceed \$100,000.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is that one limitation on income only, and the corporation owns many millions of dollars of real estate, and the influence of this great organization—and it is a very worthy organization—might be directed toward exempting all of this property that is used for educational, missionary, and charitable purposes from taxation.

Mr. OLCOTT. The specific real estate, however, that is exempted must be used for either church or educational purposes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does not the gentleman believe a limitation that the aggregate holdings of real estate shall not at any time exceed \$2,000,000 would be a proper and safe one to incorporate in the bill?

Mr. OLCOTT. I am afraid to accept that. I can understand that, with the values as they are here in Washington, the cathedral site now and the buildings that will be erected by the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church would be more

than \$2,000,000. We are about erecting a cathedral in New York where we have spent much more than that, and it is not nearly completed.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the policy is eminently better—

Mr. OLCOTT. Income-bearing property can not be greater in value than \$100,000. Therefore they would not be a monopoly, and there is no exemption of taxes on any real estate which the corporation holds from which it receives an income.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is none now perhaps. But here are numerous associations of this kind, religious and fraternal, that are securing incorporation and power under the Federal Government, and in the future they may own half of the city of Washington, and the combined influence of those great organizations throughout the country may be sufficient to exempt their entire holdings from taxation. I do not believe that the real estate of the country ought to be owned and held by corporations, except in so far as it is necessary to carry on the purpose of their creation.

Mr. OLCOTT. That was the reason that we made the amendment in the committee, that the investments can not be made in real estate. The corporation can only take real estate that is devised to it. Now the gentleman very well knows that not only here, but I think in every community, property that is owned by a religious corporation or an educational institution that is not used for purposes of religious instruction or for the purposes of education is not exempted from taxation. I think the fear of the gentleman from Indiana is unfounded.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I will not press my objection further. It may be the limitation on the income to \$100,000 is a sufficient safeguard against the inordinate accumulation of real estate by this organization. This is a very worthy institution, I know; yet I think in making legislation we ought to have in view what may possibly arise under it—the possible exercise of the power that the bill carries. Real estate ought to be in private ownership chiefly, so it will be subject to the laws of inheritance that tend to prevent its monopolization.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL SAFE DEPOSIT, SAVINGS AND TRUST COMPANY.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 8014, a similar House bill having been reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 8014) to authorize The National Safe Deposit, Savings and Trust Company of the District of Columbia, to change its name to that of National Savings and Trust Company.

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Safe Deposit, Savings and Trust Company, of the District of Columbia, a body corporate, duly incorporated under an act approved October 1, 1890, and entitled "An act to provide for the incorporation of trust, loan, mortgage, and certain other corporations within the District of Columbia," be, and is hereby, authorized to change its name to National Savings and Trust Company, the said change of name to be complete and effectual when said corporation shall have filed with the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia an amended certificate of incorporation setting forth the change in name hereby authorized, and shall also have filed a copy of said amended certificate of incorporation with the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States.

Sec. 2. That Congress may at any time amend, alter, or repeal this act.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, the bill H. R. 24841, on the same subject, was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON MARKET COMPANY.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 6470, which by error, as I think, is on the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. By mistake the bill (S. 6470) in relation to the Washington Market Company was referred to the Union Calendar. It should have been referred to the House Calendar. The Chair, under the practice, will order its transfer; and the gentleman desires to call up the Senate bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to call up the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 6470) in relation to the Washington Market Company.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Washington Market Company be, and hereby is, authorized, in connection with the refrigeration of produce stored or sold at Center Market, to manufacture ice at any suitable place within the District of Columbia.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Washington Market Company be, and it is hereby, authorized to procure by purchase or lease all or part of square No. 328 in the city of Washington, and thereon conduct a cold-storage busi-

ness and manufacture ice for use in Center Market and for sale: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to limit or affect in any way any of the provisions of 'An act to incorporate the Washington Market Company,' approved May 20, 1870.

"SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, without any liability therefor, is hereby expressly reserved."

Mr. DRISCOLL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is this to give this company the power to condemn and purchase?

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, no; I understand they own the property now, but objection was made to the bill because it did not specifically describe the property. This bill does.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like if the gentleman in charge of the bill would tell us who this Washington Market Company is and what their rights are in the premises which they now occupy.

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, I could not answer that question in detail, except to say that the Washington Market Company has the principal market here. It is a corporation authorized to do all things pertaining to a general market business. This bill is for the purpose of allowing them to build a cold storage or ice house near the depot. Under the provisions of their charter their attorney did not think they had the authority to build off the particular premises they occupy under their charter. This authorizes them to build an ice house on ground that they own.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill H. R. 20178, a similar House bill, was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS NEAR CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 4267.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 4267) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors near the Government Hospital for the Insane and the District almshouse.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful to sell, either by wholesale or retail, intoxicating liquor of any kind at any point between the Government Hospital for the Insane and the District almshouse, or within a radius of one-half mile of the boundaries of either of said properties.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 5 strike out the words "District almshouse" and insert "Home for the Aged and Infirm."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors near the Government Hospital for the Insane and the Home for the Aged and Infirm.

SUPREME LODGE OF THE KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the bill H. R. 17212.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17212) to amend an act to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of an act approved June 29, 1894, entitled "An act to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the words "not exceeding in value \$100,000;" so that said section 2 shall read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the said corporation shall have the power to take and hold real and personal estate, which shall not be divided among the members of the corporation, but shall descend to their successors for the promotion of the fraternal and benevolent purposes of said corporation."

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect from and after its passage and approval.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment along the line I offered a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. At the end of section 2 insert the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 2 insert the following:

"Provided, That said corporation shall not hold or own real estate to the aggregate value of \$1,000,000 at any time."

Mr. BABCOCK. I accept the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have two small matters here which are on the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House—

The SPEAKER. The Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; the Committee of the Whole House. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that that committee may be discharged from the consideration of the bill S. 7028 and the bill S. 3702.

Mr. SIMS. What bills are they?

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman does not need to reserve the right. He already has it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that on Mondays, notwithstanding this bill S. 7028 is on the Private Calendar, under the rule and practice, as the Chair is advised, the gentleman may call up the bill for consideration. He might move to go into Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering the bill; but now the gentleman asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House may be discharged from consideration of the bill, and that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. What bill is it?

Mr. MANN. We have not heard what the bill is yet.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 7028) for the relief of the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid from the appropriation for the water department, District of Columbia, extension of the high-service system, to the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of \$8,870, deducted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as a penalty, under contract No. 3047, dated November 11, 1901.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I propose to make the point of order against this that the Committee on the District of Columbia had no jurisdiction to consider or report the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. I have no objection to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I say at the proper time I propose to make the point of order that this is a private claim, and that the Committee on the District of Columbia had no jurisdiction to consider or report it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement in reference to this. This is money that has been appropriated by Congress for this specific purpose, but withheld by the Commissioners as a penalty.

Mr. MANN. The bill is purely a claim against the Government. As shown by the report, and practically by the bill, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia could not pay the money, not being authorized by law. The money was retained, as a penalty. Now this company presents a claim against the Government, which is like all other claims against the Government, a pure claim, not founded upon any law, not founded upon anything which can be considered by the Department. It is a pure claim against the Government, and ought to go to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this is entirely a District matter, on a District contract, and that the Commissioners have asked authority to make this payment, which they believe is in justice due to these parties.

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of the Chair to clause 3 of Rule XXI, page 281 of the Manual, which provides that no bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following-named committees, naming various committees not including the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin another bill similar to this?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman spoke of two bills.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is another bill (S. 3702) for the relief of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, of the District of Columbia, but it is not in the same status as this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to clauses 1 and 2 of Rule XXII. The Chair would be glad if the gentleman from Wisconsin would ask unanimous consent that the committee may be discharged and that he may call this bill up to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal. The point of order would lie, if it would lie at all, in the event that the committee was discharged. It seems to be a question for which there is no precedent. It requires an examination of Rules XXI and XXII and some consideration, and the Chair would be glad to have until to-morrow morning to consider it.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to discharging the committee from further consideration of the bill and letting it go over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MANN. Because, if it were in order, it could be called up now.

Mr. BABCOCK. But the Chair desires that the matter go over until to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not decide upon it, as it is now before the Chair.

Mr. MANN. If it is in order, he can move now to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. I am perfectly willing that it should await the decision of the Chair until to-morrow morning, without taking any advantage at this time.

The SPEAKER. Then it will be in order to-morrow morning as of to-day.

GURLEY MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the other bill referred to (S. 3702) for the relief of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I wish to say that this bill was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia under Rule XXI by the unanimous order of the House. It was referred to the Committee on Claims and reported back to the House with the request that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was done by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration and that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the request, but I wish to make the same point of order.

The SPEAKER. Precisely. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Illinois desires to make a point of order. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, both of the bills involve the same construction of a rule, but under different circumstances, and I suggest that they both go over so that they can be both decided in the morning.

Mr. BABCOCK. This, Mr. Speaker, was sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia under Rule XXI by the unanimous consent of the House, and reported back to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Claims, complying exactly with the rules.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understand, but the rule provides that an erroneous reference under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction on the committee.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman read that part of the rule he read in the first place?

Mr. MANN. Rule XXI, clause 2, provides for a reference, but the latter part of the rule provides that an erroneous reference under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee. I suggest that, involving the construction of the same rule under different circumstances, they both might well be considered and decided at the same time to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to what seems to the Chair to be a distinction between this bill and the one that goes over until to-morrow. This bill was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the distinction to which the Speaker desires to refer. In one case the bill is referred merely by a Member introducing it and by writing the name of the committee on it and putting it in the basket. In the other case it again comes before the House, having been referred by a Member, and by unanimous consent is referred to another committee.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But it involves a construction of the same rule; and while there is a distinction, I do not mean to say that the Chair may not properly hold that this bill is properly before the House. I suggest, however, that as long as one is to go over both may properly go over and be considered at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman also to the fact that this is a Senate bill, and a Member has nothing to do with the reference of it. Under the rule the Speaker, acting for the House, referred it to the Committee on Claims. The Committee on Claims brought it back to the House, and the House, by unanimous consent, changed the reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia. So that it is the action of the House, and it has been ruled that such

action confers jurisdiction without regard to the rules in many cases, many precedents.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the Chair has good reasons for the position which he may assume; but if that be the decision, then the latter part of that clause apparently means but very little, because in section 2, which is that clause, it refers not to a bill referred by the Member in the basket, but to a bill referred by the House, and the latter part of the clause says that an erroneous reference under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee to consider or report the same.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman will notice that the rule he now refers to seems to cover House bills referred by Members. This is a Senate bill, referred originally by the Speaker to the Committee on Claims, and, under Rule XXIV, reported back from the Committee on Claims with recommendations that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the House unanimously referred it to that committee. There are many precedents where, without regard to the rule, the House by a majority has referred bills to committees, thereby conferring jurisdiction.

The Chair is inclined to the opinion that as to this bill the point is not well taken.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair is prepared to rule, of course I have no desire to have it go over, but—

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the point is not well taken as to this bill. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the trustees or other authorized representatives of the various religious and educational institutions mentioned herein the sums set forth in their respective cases, said amounts having been heretofore erroneously paid by the said religious and educational institutions on account of special assessments or taxes levied against such religious and educational institutions, and which character of assessments or taxes the court of appeals of the District of Columbia heretofore held, in the case of the District of Columbia against Sisters of the Visitation, of Washington, reported in volume 15, Tucker's Reports, page 300 et seq., to be illegal and void and not a charge against such property.

Educational properties: Corcoran Gallery of Art, \$161.53; Columbian University, \$135.05; medical and dental department, National University, \$77.38; Howard University, \$613.14.

Religious properties: Church of the Covenant, \$167.01; Shiloh Baptist Church, \$9.70; Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, \$214.32; St. Matthew's Church, \$300.48; All Souls' Church, \$114.32; Epiphany Church, \$12.23; Fourth Baptist Church, \$66.18; Universalist General Convention, \$76.95; St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, \$145.52; Marvin Methodist Episcopal Church, \$17.94; Westminster Presbyterian Church, \$44.76; Lutheran Church, \$16.18; Mount Moriah Baptist Church, \$48.60; Gonzaga College (St. Aloysius Church), \$79.40; vestry of St. Mark's Parish, \$41.31; Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, \$70.21; German Baptist Brethren Church, \$44.45; Mount Jezreel Church, \$12.85; Washington Seventh Day Adventist Church, \$49.56; Ninth Street Christian Church, \$52.27; Douglas Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, \$23.05; Israel Baptist Church, \$14.48; Missionary Board Brethren Church, \$22.96; St. Cyprian's Church, \$82.66; East Washington Station Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, \$20.30; Methodist Protestant Church, \$192.95; First Colored Baptist Church, \$25.83; Ebenezer African Methodist Episcopal Church, \$24.72; B. T. McCoy and others, trustees of church, \$90; First Baptist Church, Mount Pleasant, \$375; Mount Pleasant Congregational Society, \$79.96; vestry of Takoma Parish, \$35.69; Memorial Church of the United Brethren in Christ, of Washington, D. C., \$62.19; Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, \$200.24; Presbyterian Alliance, \$86.07; St. Anthony's Church, \$122.50; Brookland Baptist Church, \$35.85; vestry Emanuel Protestant Episcopal Church, \$35.60.

Provided, That the amounts herein authorized and directed to be paid shall be payable out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time; was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 129 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

REPRINT OF REPORT ON RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman kindly yield to me while I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of a document?

Mr. OLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 500 additional copies be printed of the report of the river and harbor bill, Report No. 6752.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the reprint of 500 additional copies of the report on the river and harbor bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CONNECTING PARKWAY BETWEEN SIXTEENTH STREET AND ROCK CREEK PARK.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 129) for the opening of a connecting parkway along Piney Branch between Sixteenth street and Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill

and that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the substitute, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under and in accordance with the provisions of sections 491a to 491n, both inclusive, of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within ninety days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for connecting Sixteenth street with Rock Creek Park by a parkway of not more than 500 feet in width extending along or in the valley of Piney Branch, District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$600, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, one half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide the necessary funds for the cost and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto, to be reimbursed to the revenues of the District of Columbia and the United States in equal parts from assessments for benefits when the same are collected, and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of all judgments and awards is hereby appropriated, one half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I send the following amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment to the substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 18, strike out the word "five" where it appears in said line and insert in lieu thereof the following: "an average of four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The substitute as amended was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS FROM PAVED SIDEWALKS AND ALLEYS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 20067) for the removal of obstructions from sidewalks. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and I ask that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20067) to remove dirt, gravel, sand, and other obstructions from the paved sidewalks and alleys in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union may be discharged from the further consideration of this bill and it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, empowered and directed to levy a special tax, to become due and payable after the time of doing the work hereinafter mentioned when and as general taxes on real estate in said District are payable, and subject to all general tax laws on real estate in said District not inconsistent herewith, of \$1 per linear foot on and against any improved or unimproved lot in said district not owned, rented, leased, or occupied by the United States and the District of Columbia, respectively, or foreign governments, embassies, legations, ambassadors, or ministers for each front from which lot dirt, gravel, sand, or other obstruction falls, caves, washes, and becomes deposited on the abutting or adjacent paved sidewalks or alleys within said District, and which remains thereon and is caused to be removed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia at any time after notice which the Commissioners of said District shall cause to be given in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia," and so forth, approved April 14, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to make, establish, alter, and amend, from time to time, as they may find necessary, all needful rules and regulations which are required in their judgment to properly administer and enforce the operation of this act: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed to make the District of Columbia or the said Commissioners liable at the suit of private individuals or private or public corporations for any default, failure, or neglect in the administration of this act, and no action shall accrue therefor.

SEC. 2. That in order to enable the said Commissioners to comply with their duties under this act and to carry it into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to advance to the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia, in manner now prescribed by law, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as the said Commissioners may find necessary to use for the purposes hereof, and to reimburse the Treasury for one-half of said advance, payable out of the taxes and revenues collected, as herein provided.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have some ex-

planation of this bill, as it seems to be an entirely new proposition.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is strongly recommended and asked for by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in order to make some proper penalty to persons who own property, improved or otherwise, and who do not take proper care of the embankments adjoining sidewalks, and when rains come and dirt falls down on the sidewalks the District is obliged, unless a bill of this character is passed, to remove the dirt from these banks at the expense of the District. This bill is to give the Commissioners authority to collect from the owners of property a penalty for not taking care of their own property with consideration of the rights of citizens of Washington.

Mr. MANN. How often may this assessment be levied?

Mr. OLCOTT. I presume the assessment will be levied immediately after the work is performed on any particular piece of property.

Mr. MANN. It will likely be two or three times a year?

Mr. OLCOTT. Whatever charge there is against the property. If they are not taking care of their own property, there will be a lien upon that property and it will be filed in the usual way as penalties for the violation of any other municipal ordinance are levied and collected.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says "not taking care of their own property." This bill is not confined to a question of whether this man takes care of his own property or not. Any dirt that is deposited on the sidewalk by anybody, under this bill, it being the duty of the District to keep the sidewalk clean—somebody deposits dirt upon the sidewalk, or it washes from some lot onto the sidewalk—

Mr. OLCOTT. I have always believed it was the duty of those who owned property to care for the sidewalk connected therewith. This has nothing to do with the street. We have now an ordinance against allowing snow and ice to remain on the sidewalk.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, I suppose, is aware that the court has held that that law is invalid?

Mr. OLCOTT. The law in regard to the removal of snow and ice?

Mr. MANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OLCOTT. I am not aware of it, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is in error.

Mr. MANN. I will inform the gentleman that it has been so held by the court in the District. It is invalid, and I judge this law will be invalid.

Mr. OLCOTT. The decision was in regard to a law that previously existed, and at the last session of Congress we passed a law providing for the objections that were raised by the court itself, and this follows the lines exactly of the law that was passed to meet the decision of the supreme court to the effect that the previous law was unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 4.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER proceeded to count.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] that there is evidently no quorum present, and it will be a good time to adjourn.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie over, retaining its present status, until the next District day.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraw his point on the condition that the bill go over as unfinished business?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to withdrawing the point of no quorum if the bill is to be laid aside.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be laid aside.

The SPEAKER. The bill necessarily will come up as unfinished business on the next District day. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws his point of no quorum.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill S. 7042.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] calls up the bill S. 7042, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

To transfer jurisdiction of the Washington Aqueduct, the filtration plant, and appurtenances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after July 1, 1907, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have all the powers and be subject to all the duties and limitations which under existing law are delegated to and imposed upon the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in so far as the same relate to the jurisdiction and control over the Washington Aqueduct and its appurtenances in the District of Columbia, State of Virginia, and State of Maryland; and the said Commissioners are hereby given sole control over the Conduit road and the filtration plant, it being the intention of this act that the entire control over the Washington Aqueduct and all of its appurtenances, the filtration plant, Conduit road, all water mains, and the water-distribution system of the District of Columbia shall, on and after said date, be under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction and control of the said Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and that the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall be relieved of all duty and responsibility in connection with all of such work; and the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers shall, on request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, deliver to them all existing plans, surveys, and records, or duly certified copies thereof, deemed necessary or required by said Commissioners to enable them to discharge the duties imposed on them by this act, the cost of making said copies to be paid by said Commissioners; and all property connected with said works shall be delivered to said Commissioners; and all appropriations available for the Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia, and its appurtenances, including the filtration plant, shall be expended under the direction and control of the Commissioners of said District, and the employees paid from said appropriations shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the said Commissioners for assignment to such duties as may be deemed necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That the supply of water to all buildings, parks, structures, lands, etc., owned or used by the United States shall be at all times free and unrestricted.

Sec. 2. That all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. The bill is upon the Union Calendar.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it ought to be fully considered, as I understand it takes the water system out from under the control of the War Department and puts it in the hands of the District Commissioners.

The SPEAKER. The bill can not be considered in the House without unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that it must be considered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I will take up no further business to-day, except to ask for the appointment of conferees on the bill (S. 6364) to incorporate the National Child Labor Committee.

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 6364) to incorporate the National Child Labor Committee, with House amendment disagreed to.

Mr. BABCOCK. I move to insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, and Mr. SIMS as conferees.

VIEWS OF MINORITY ON SHIPPING BILL.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement had with the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the substitute reported from that committee for the bill S. 529, called the "ship-subsidy bill."

The SPEAKER. Consent has already been granted, the Chair believes.

Mr. SPIGHT. No, sir; I think not. I do not think it appears of record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the minority was given until Tuesday to file their views.

The views of the minority were ordered printed.

PRINTING REPORT OF POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House of Representatives 10,000 copies of the Report of the Postal Commission, appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department, approved June 26, 1906, being House Document No. —, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session.

Mr. PAYNE. Is that report from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is this from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to fill the blank?

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know the number of the document. I think it has not been given a number yet; but the document is sufficiently described, however.

Mr. PAYNE. It seems to me there ought to be an estimate of cost.

The SPEAKER. The document can be ascertained without number.

Mr. GRIGGS. I think it is sufficiently described.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF POSTAL COMMISSION AND TESTIMONY.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 6,000 copies of the Report of the Postal Commission appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department, approved June 26, 1906, being House Document No. —, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, to be accompanied by the testimony taken by the said Commission, together with the accompanying exhibits and digests, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

ALLIS-CHALMERS COMPANY, OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I understand the objection has been withdrawn to the consideration of the bill S. 7028.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order on the Allis-Chalmers claim because on its face it seemed to me that it was subject to the point of order that it did not come from the proper committee. Upon a further investigation it seems to me to be a good claim for services rendered the District of Columbia; and therefore, so far as I am concerned, I withdraw the point of order.

The bill was read, as follows:

An act (S. 7028) for the relief of the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid from the appropriation for the water department, District of Columbia, extension of the high-service system, to the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of \$8,870, deducted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as a penalty, under contract No. 3047, dated November 11, 1901.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF FEED SUPPLIES AT FORT ASSINNIBOINE, MONT.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution 231, authorizing the Secretary of War to sell certain hay, straw, and grain at Fort Assiniboine, Mont.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized to cause to be sold to the citizens of Montana, at its actual cost to the United States at place of sale, such limited quantities of hay, straw, and grain for domestic uses as, in his judgment, can safely be spared from the stock provided for the use of the garrison at Fort Assiniboine, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, is this a Senate or House resolution?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. It is a House resolution.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask if there is any time limitation for that? Is this forever, or for the season?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I will say in answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, that I have received a telegram showing the urgent necessity for this provision. I understand that there are from 15,000 to 20,000 head of cattle in that neighborhood that are on the very verge of starvation. We merely ask that permission to be given to the Secretary of War to sell them some hay and such garrison stores as are in excess of their wants.

Mr. MANN. I did not catch anything in the reading of this to indicate how long it would last.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I copied it from a resolution that was passed in the last Congress.

Mr. MANN. It seems to provide forever.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I will move to insert an amendment limiting the time.

Mr. MANN. Say within the next three months.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. The next three weeks will do.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "sold" the words "within the next three months."

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Three months will cover it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to insert this telegram in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The telegram is as follows:

FORT BENTON, MONT., January 28, 1907.

Hon. Jos. M. Dixon,
House of Representatives, Washington:

Will you have War Department authorize commandant at Fort Assiniboine to furnish hay to ranchers in such quantities as can be spared on guaranty of Stockmen's National Bank that same will be returned in like quantity and quality as soon as weather will permit? This request is made by people here to prevent threatened loss of stock through hay shortage and continued storms and cold weather. Please answer my expense.

CHAS. N. PRAY.

LAND FOR UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25013) granting to the regents of the University of Oklahoma section No. 36, in township No. 9 north, of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of section No. 36, in township No. 9 north, of range No. 3 west, of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla., the same being a portion of the lands reserved to said Territory for common school purposes, be, and the same is hereby, granted to the regents of the University of Oklahoma, to be and become the property of the University of Oklahoma for the purpose of being used for and securing a proper campus and grounds for building purposes for the use of the said university, but no indemnity either in money or in land shall be allowed the State of Oklahoma for this section: *Provided,* That the board of regents of the university may use or dispose of and convey any portion of said grounds for the purpose of acquiring grounds contiguous to the present grounds belonging to said university and to enlarge the campus and grounds for building and campus purposes in connection therewith.

Sec. 2. That the leases to the present tenants thereon, made by the board for leasing school lands in the Territory of Oklahoma, shall remain in full force and effect until their respective expirations, and that the governor of the Territory of Oklahoma shall appoint, on the application of the board of regents of said University of Oklahoma, three disinterested freeholders of said county to appraise the value of the improvements on said lands belonging to the lessees thereof, and such improvements shall be appraised at the fair, reasonable value thereof, and the said appraisers shall give ten days' notice of the time when such appraisal shall be made by posting the same in a conspicuous place on each quarter section of said lands, and shall take an oath fairly and impartially to appraise the improvements of the said lessees on said lands at the fair, reasonable value thereof, and shall make report of such appraisal and file the same with the governor of the Territory of Oklahoma with such oath, and the board of regents of said University of Oklahoma shall immediately pay the amount so fixed to the treasurer of the Territory of Oklahoma for the use of such lessees and have immediate possession of said lands: *Provided,* That if either the board of regents of said University of Oklahoma or said lessees shall feel themselves aggrieved by the valuation of such appraisers, they may within thirty days from the filing of such report with the governor of the Territory appeal to the district court of said county by filing notice with the governor of said Territory and filing a bond to be approved by the governor conditioned that such person or said board of regents will prosecute such appeal to effect and without unnecessary delay, and pay all costs and judgments that may be awarded against them in said proceeding. And the governor of said Territory shall immediately cause a copy of the application of said board and the appointment and oath and report of said appraisers, together with the bond aforesaid, to be filed with the clerk of the district court of said Cleveland County, whereupon the question of the amount of damages sustained by such lessees shall be tried de novo by a jury: *And provided further,* That the board of regents of said University of Oklahoma are hereby vested with full authority, on behalf of said Territory, to settle and adjust the differences between said board of regents and the lessees of such lands and make such settlements as the board of regents may deem just and proper: *And provided further,* That when said Territory shall become a State the governor of said State shall be the successor of the governor of said Territory under the provision of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MINNESOTA.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 7827) permitting the building of a railway bridge across the Mississippi River in Morrison County, State of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House from the Speaker's table a Senate bill substantially the same as a House bill on the Calendar, which bill the Clerk will report.

The bill was read.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BUCKMAN), the corresponding House bill on the Calendar was ordered to lie on the table.

FILES, ETC., OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution

211, authorizing the transfer of the files, books, and pamphlets of the Industrial Commission.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all official minutes and files of correspondence of the Industrial Commission deposited with the Librarian of Congress by the joint resolution of February 21, 1902, be transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor, to become the property of said Department. The Librarian of Congress is hereby authorized to select from the volumes and pamphlets constituting the library of the Industrial Commission such publications as may be needed for the uses of the Library of Congress, which books shall become the property of the Library of Congress, and to turn over the residue of such volumes and pamphlets to the Department of Commerce and Labor, to become the property of the said Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I understand this altogether. How many volumes will there be, and what is meant by their becoming the property of the Department of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that by act of Congress several years ago a body was created called the "Industrial Commission." During its investigations the Commission gathered up certain statistics, papers, books of reference, and so forth. Upon the expiration of the term of the Commission those books and papers were, by resolution of Congress, temporarily placed for safe-keeping in the building of the Library of Congress. They are in the way there. The Library of Congress has use for perhaps part of the books, but not for the records and other papers. On the other hand, I am advised that the Department of Commerce and Labor would like very much to have the originals of these documents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are they going to do with them when they get them?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They want them for their files. I presume, for purposes of reference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many sets of them are there?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They constitute all the papers, letters, books, and everything gathered up by the Industrial Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are they printed?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Some of them are printed and some of them are letters and other papers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not something that can be distributed, then?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. No; there is just the one set.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I wanted to know—just one set?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. How much space do they occupy now?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. So much space that the officials of the library object to their remaining there, because they need that space, and the officials of the Department of Commerce and Labor desire them for their reference library.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is aware that the whole Department of Commerce and Labor and its entire building would not occupy as much space as one set of the book stacks in the Library, and they have a great many book stacks in the Library and not an inch of available space in the Department of Commerce and Labor to-day.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The best place for this material is in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. MANN. The other day the Committee on Appropriations recommended that all of these books now in the Department of Commerce and Labor be transferred to the Library. To that I objected on a point of order, and it went out of that bill. And in their absence I shall object to this.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This is not a matter that the Committee on Appropriations has properly to do with. It is a matter over which the Committee on the Library has jurisdiction.

Mr. MANN. But the Committee on Appropriations brought in a recommendation that all of these Department libraries be abolished. The gentleman did not make the point of order; I made the point of order and it went out on that point of order. The Committee on Appropriations was insistent that all Department libraries be abolished, and now the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] proposes not only not to abolish the libraries, but to put a set of books more in that Department.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This is material which the Department of Commerce and Labor desires for the use of its officials.

Mr. MANN. Why, in that case they can go and consult it here, and we may go and consult it if we desire if it is over here where it belongs—in the Congressional Library.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, does this require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I object, and we will bring the matter to a conclusion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

EXTENDING TIME TO CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate joint resolution 86, granting an extension of time to certain homestead entrymen with House amendments, with an amendment by the Senate to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the amendment of the Senate to the House amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this the bill that was passed through the other day giving an extension of time to homesteaders?

Mr. LACEY. Yes. The only effect of this amendment by the Senate was to change the words "joint resolution 81" to "public resolution No. 4," that resolution having since become a law. A reference now to this would be as appears in the laws rather than by the number that it appeared to have when passing through the House. That is the only effect of this amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House concur.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter; which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 28, 1907.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the governor of Kansas my resignation as a Representative in the Fifty-ninth Congress from the First district of the State of Kansas.

Will you be good enough to inform the House of my action, together with my assurances of continued good will and good wishes for the Representatives with whom I have long been so pleasantly associated?

With warm personal regards and with great respect, I am,

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES CURTIS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN, for one week, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. AIKEN, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. SAMUEL, on Monday, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE, at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m., the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action by the court in the cases of Mary M. King and others against The United States, dismissed for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, submitting a report of mail deposited by his department in the Washington post-office under the penalty provision from July 1 to December 31, 1906—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for the court-house and custom-house at Laredo, Tex.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, with a recommendation, a draft of a concurrent resolution for the printing of the report of the governor of Hawaii for the year 1906—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, submitting a report of the investigation of the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies in coal and oil—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Report of the Postal Commission, authorized by Congress to make inquiry regarding second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, with

a copy of a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, a report as to reclamation by drainage of the swamps tributary to Mud River, near Thief River Falls, Minn.—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1726) making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in St. Augustine, Fla., known as "The Lines," for school purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6893); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGUIRE, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25013) granting to the regents of the University of Oklahoma section No. 36, in township No. 9 north, of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6894); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24829) granting an increase of pension to John R. Robbins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6753); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24801) granting an increase of pension to George G. Martin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6754); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24397) granting an increase of pension to David Prunkard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6755); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24344) granting an increase of pension to John H. James, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6756); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24288) granting an increase of pension to John Gooding, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6757); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24028) granting a pension to George H. Boney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6758); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23968) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McWhorter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6759); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23442) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lawley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6760); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20952) granting an increase of pension to John W. Howe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6761); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20622) granting a pension to Samuel Shoener, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6762); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14228) granting an increase of pension to Abram Nussbaum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6763); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20414) granting an increase of pension to Albert Launt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6764); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18831) granting an increase of pension to James R. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6765); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21711) granting an increase of pension to Thor Nelson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6766); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22630) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Wiley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6767); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22727) granting an increase of pension to John Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6768); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22823) granting an increase of pension to John Tipton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6769); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22547) granting an increase of pension to John Hickox, jr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6770); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22562) granting an increase of pension to George J. Abbey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6771); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22302) granting an increase of pension to Burrell H. Gillam, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6772); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22529) granting an increase of pension to William Truett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6773); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22785) granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Pratt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6774); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22763) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Slocum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6775); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22617) granting an increase of pension to Margaret O'Reilly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6776); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21306) granting an increase of pension to James Pool, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6777); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21336) granting an increase of pension to Herman Hoffmeister, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6778); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21342) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Parker, reported the same

with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6779); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18604) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Luman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6780); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18814) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Knapp, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6781); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19599) granting an increase of pension to William J. Large, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6782); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19739) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Miner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6783); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20062) granting an increase of pension to Philip Lape, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6784); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11621) granting an increase of pension to Hollis Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6785); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11995) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Layton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6786); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16439) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Bogan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6787); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21348) granting an increase of pension to William Seymour Alden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6788); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16608) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McNamee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6789); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21525) granting an increase of pension to John Short, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6790); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16687) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson G. Turner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6791); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15688) granting an increase of pension to Esther C. Kelly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6792); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21559) granting an increase of pension to William Ivers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6793); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21659) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Sevin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6794); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21746) granting an increase of pension to William N. Carlisle, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6795); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21974) grant-

ing an increase of pension to John W. Lowell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6796); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22055) granting an increase of pension to Maria Lorch, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6797); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to Andrew I. Sproul, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23912) granting an increase of pension to James E. Fitzgerald, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22093) granting an increase of pension to Lars Isaacson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22169) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia M. Bryson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6801); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22199) granting an increase of pension to William Templin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6802); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22540) granting an increase of pension to Richard Turnbull, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6803); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1223) granting a pension to Andrew Jarvis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dallman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6805); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Sampson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Asa J. Clothier, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2324) granting a pension to Christina Vetter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2905) granting an increase of pension to Burr Clark, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3239) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to John C. McGinis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wilkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Edward Willis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12346) granting an increase of pension to Abraham D. Stouffer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5029) granting an increase of pension to Beverly W. Sullivan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim M. Boltz, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5388) for the relief of Silas Garrison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5627) granting an increase of pension to John C. L. Hargis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5926) granting a pension to Sarah Pitman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6237) granting an increase of pension to David Bethusum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Matlack, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to James P. Bledsoe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8775) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Diefenbach, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8785) granting an increase of pension to John Finch, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9850) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Williams, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11198) granting an increase of pension to E. Sandusky, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6826); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11401) granting an increase of pension to William Kling, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17307) granting an increase of pension to John A. Baker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6828); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17394) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Boggs, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17655) granting an increase of pension to Fritz Dettmann, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18396) granting an increase of pension to John Nix, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6831); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18515) granting an increase of pension to Martin Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6832); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24101) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ashton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6833); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13012) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Cole, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6834); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17002) granting an increase of pension to Levi Deater, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6835); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16718) granting an increase of pension to James Miltimore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6836); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13810) granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. Simmons, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6837); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15779) granting a pension to Margaret A. Jordan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6838); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16343) granting an increase of pension to Francis D. Matheny, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6839); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20590) granting an increase of pension to Hannah O. Reynolds, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6840); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20840) granting a pension to Thomas M. Lord, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6841); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22283) granting an increase of pension to Stoddard Caswell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6842); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23148) granting an increase of pension to Robert Liddell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6843); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23175) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Fuller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6844); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23282) granting an increase of pension to John W. Tumey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6845); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23313) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin D. Reed, reported the same with amendment, ac-

companied by a report (No. 6846); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pension, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23309) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Wallis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6847); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23626) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Taylor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6848); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23660) granting an increase of pension to Harriet U. Burgess, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6849); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23682) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Bartlett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6850); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20588) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas S. Cantine, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6851); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23323) granting an increase of pension to Robert Foote, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6852); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23360) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hastie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6853); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23443) granting an increase of pension to Louisa R. Matthews, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6854); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23709) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6855); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23763) granting an increase of pension to James Riley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6856); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23802) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brown, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6857); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23806) granting an increase of pension to William F. Barker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6858); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23852) granting an increase of pension to James G. Crozer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6859); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23860) granting an increase of pension to William G. Cummings, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6860); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23890) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Haslam, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6861); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23961) granting an increase of pension to Oscar N. Cowell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6862); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24037) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Teeple, reported the same

with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6863); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24068) granting an increase of pension to John Maginnis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6864); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24269) granting an increase of pension to William L. Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6865); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24338) granting an increase of pension to James M. Gardner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6866); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24343) granting an increase of pension to James M. Haney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6867); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24355) granting a pension to Mary O. Learned, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6868); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24404) granting a pension to Lauraette La Fluer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6869); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24419) granting a pension to Belle M. Ocker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6870); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24553) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Reed, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6871); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24577) granting an increase of pension to John L. Flannery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6872); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24599) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Richardson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6873); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23150) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. W. Riter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6874); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24635) granting a pension to Elizabeth Stuessi, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6875); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20959) granting an increase of pension to William G. Dickey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6876); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24740) granting an increase of pension to William E. Chase, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6877); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12240) granting an increase of pension to Albert I. Ackerly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6878); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23967) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6879); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23982) granting

an increase of pension to Thomas A. Seed, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6880); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24034) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Banta, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6881); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24079) granting an increase of pension to David Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6882); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24100) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6883); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24183) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Joyce, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6884); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24210) granting an increase of pension to George H. Maddox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6885); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24220) granting an increase of pension to William P. Robbe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6886); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24225) granting an increase of pension to William Ivans, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6887); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24294) granting a pension to D. R. Lamoreau, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6888); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20890) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Doughty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6889); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Luke Reynolds, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6890); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to David C. May, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6891); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22294) granting an increase of pension to Perry Lamphere, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6892); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 25030) authorizing the extension of Park place NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 25031) to regulate commerce in adulterated and misbranded seed and to prevent the sale or transportation thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 25032) to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1902—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25033) providing for two additional circuit judges in the ninth judicial circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 25034) to change the

time of holding circuit and district courts of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 25035) in relation to increase of age pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 25036) to regulate embalming in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 25037) to define the duties of the board of education of the District of Columbia, to further reorganize the schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 25038) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to the compensation of national-bank examiners—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 25039) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Arizona Territory, to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company and to extend and improve said plant—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25040) amending chapter 771 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to customs districts of Arizona—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 25041) to provide for the creation of additional land districts in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 25042) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 25043) to authorize the Atlanta, Birmingham and Atlantic Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 25044) authorizing certain changes in the permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 25045) to appropriate money for the payment of certain advances made to the United States by the State of Maryland—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 25046) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 25047) creating a tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 25048) for the restoration, reconstruction, and repair of the east front of the Treasury building, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 25049) to encourage agriculture in the Philippine Islands by providing that the Philippine government may loan to agriculturists in said islands a fund equal in amount to the net seigniorage profit derived by the Philippine government from the recoinage of certain coins—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 25050) to regulate practice on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States and the United States circuit courts of appeal—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 25051) providing and making appropriation for a pneumatic-tube system between the appraiser's warehouse and the new custom-house in New York City—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WASKEY: A bill (H. R. 25052) to modify the law pertaining to the acquisition and holding of placer claims in the district of Alaska and providing for the building of wagon roads therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 25053) to provide for the establishment of an agricultural bank in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 25054) to amend an act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 25055) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire additional land for Federal building site at Mason City, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 25056) to provide for the transfer to the State of South Carolina of certain school funds for use of free schools in the parishes of

St. Helena and St. Luke, in said State—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 25057) authorizing a survey to be made of the lands suited to national forest reserve purposes in the Appalachian Mountains within the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee, and in the White Mountains in the State of New Hampshire, to be known as the Appalachian Forest Reserve and the White Mountain Forest Reserve, respectively—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS: A resolution (H. Res. 796) authorizing the employment of a messenger for duty on the heavy mail wagon—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana: A resolution (H. Res. 797) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report of the Postal Commission, etc.—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 50) providing for the printing of 6,000 copies of the report of the Postal Commission, etc.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RHODES: A resolution (H. Res. 798) to continue the compilation and index of reports of committees from the Forty-ninth to the Fifty-ninth Congress, inclusive—to the Committee on Accounts.

* PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 25058) granting an increase of pension to James Hooker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 25059) for the relief of Anthony Wasilius—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 25060) granting a pension to Amos Faust—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 25061) granting an increase of pension to Mary Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25062) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 25063) granting an increase of pension to Emmett L. Warren, alias Alonson Warren—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 25064) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Stilley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25065) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hancher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 25066) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Cheap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 25067) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Bomar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 25068) for the relief of Charles Joseph Francis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 25069) granting an increase of pension to William A. Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 25070) granting an increase of pension to John R. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25071) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Moody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 25072) for the relief of W. N. Gladney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 25073) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25074) granting an increase of pension to Christian Sorensen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25075) granting an increase of pension to Henry Slaymaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25076) granting an increase of pension to James F. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25077) granting an increase of pension to George French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25078) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25079) granting an increase of pension to David Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25080) granting an increase of pension to James Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25081) granting an increase of pension to Michael Denyant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25082) granting an increase of pension to John G. Snook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25083) granting an increase of pension to George Sowerwine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25084) granting an increase of pension to Hosea Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25085) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25086) granting a pension to Joseph Posey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25087) granting an increase of pension to Abraham F. Rouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25088) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Dow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25089) granting an increase of pension to William Q. Mahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25090) granting an increase of pension to Otis B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 25091) granting an increase of pension to Newton A. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 25092) granting an increase of pension to Charles Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25093) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Klinedinst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 25094) for the relief of the trustees of the Olive Branch Christian Church, of James City County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 25095) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Gilpatrick—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25096) granting an increase of pension to Martha Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 25097) granting an increase of pension to E. P. Weatherby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 25098) granting an increase of pension to Granville H. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 25099) for the relief of Great Slakehatchie Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 25100) granting an increase of pension to R. M. Musser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 25101) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Meredith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25102) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Barks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 25103) granting an increase of pension to James H. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 25104) for the relief of the heirs of Lawrence D. Greaves, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 25105) for the relief of A. E. Couch—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 25106) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Biffan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25107) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia H. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 25108) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25109) granting a pension to Hans F. Hirte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 25110) to grant an honorable discharge to Orthiel H. Rhodes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 25111) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 25112) granting an increase of pension to William Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 25113) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 25114) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Joseph Brenise—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25115) granting a pension to Florence K. Patterson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25116) granting a pension to Emma L. Beatty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 25117) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25118) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hotchkiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 25119) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. McGuirsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 25120) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Spring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 25121) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Peltier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25022) for the relief of Elizabeth Auerswald—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 24809) granting an increase of pension to Mary Webster Lusk—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24944) granting an increase of pension to Louis Lamb—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of railway employees in various parts of the United States, for bill S. 5133 (the sixteen-hour bill)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of St. Louis Typographical Union, No. 8, for a construction of the laws relating to second-class mail matter more favorable to certain publishers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Order of Railway Conductors and Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen of the Boston and Maine system, for enactment of bill S. 5133 (the sixteen-hour bill)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Philip S. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFIELD: Petitions of citizens of Greene, Pa.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Divine, Ky.; Calhoun, Mich.; Grayling, Mich.; Davison, S. Dak.; Montevallo, Ala.; Putnam, Conn.; Decatur, Ill.; Pocahontas, Ark.; Portsmouth, N. H., and Macon, Ala., against bill S. 5221, to restrict the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEDE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Hooker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of N. C. Tankersley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William C. Berlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of Allensville Council, No. 133, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of Immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of certain volunteer officers of the United States Navy during the war of the rebellion, asking certain rank and pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of the Central Trades Council of Mobile, Ala., against ship subsidy—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for legislation requiring common carriers to use all safety appliances on rolling stock, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the State board of agriculture of Massachusetts, favoring the suppression of the gypsy ant brown-tail moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Private Commercial School Managers' Association, in favor of a revision of the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of August Harey, against intervention in Kongo affairs—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of

the United States, against enactment of bill S. 4403 with the educational test—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of C. J. Francis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULKERSON: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to James M. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish War, for a ship adequate for the requirements of Illinois Naval Reserve—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, for the bill S. 5133, limiting hours of service, and bill H. R. 9328, to regulate granting of restraining orders—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. Parlett Lloyd, against the clause in McCumber bill (S. 976) prohibiting fees to attorneys and claim agents—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Milo B. Stevens & Co., against the clause in McCumber bill (S. 976) prohibiting fees to attorneys and claim agents—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Merchant Marine League, for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Milo B. Stevens & Co., against adoption of the no-fee provision of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of C. W. Gearcow et al., of Niagara, N. Dak., for amendment of the denaturized alcohol law so as to permit of small distilleries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, for the ship-subsidy bill (S. 529)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. J. L. Boone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo, Cal., for settlement of international troubles by the Hague Court of Arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of P. R. Pickering et al., against employment of Asiatic cooly labor on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Robert C. C. Smith, of New Britain, Conn., for the Littlefield-Carmack original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of A. G. Spence, John Dillon, L. C. Hult, J. C. Bryant, S. S. Hinitt, J. E. Hough, and H. L. Duval, all railway conductors, for bill S. 5133 (the sixteen-hour bill)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Omaha Woman's Club, for investigation relative to the industrial condition of women and children—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Bachtel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Mr. H. Barley and 13 residents of San Francisco, against Japanese and Chinese labor on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of Carl J. Horner, Charles A. Hoyle, A. P. Jordan, Stephen Murphy, J. M. Eppenhelm, Charles Wesley Ahearn, S. Green, Baldwin Coolidge, the C. F. Corey Studio Company, the Nolman Photo Company, Frank B. Conlin, Odin Frits, Henry H. Pierce, W. H. Partridge, and Luther H. Shattuck, against the proposed amendment to the new copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Boston Council of Jewish Women, against the "low-vitality" or "poor-physique" clause of the immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Society of Arts, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for forest reservation in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Abraham Rubenstein, Philip Shurdut, the Young Men's Hebrew Association of Boston, Nathan Wanman, Harris Sipperstein, Solomon Sacks, Samuel Model, A. S. Silya, Morris Hurwitz, Julius Yaffe, Alfred T. Hurwitz, Louis Gordon, Samuel Ruttenberg, Philip Rosenthal, the Federation of Jewish Organizations in Massachusetts; Puritan Lodge, I. O. B. A., No. 257; Mitchell Freeman; Grand Lodge, I. O. B. A.; J. J. Silverman, Abram J. Epstein; Pride of Massachusetts Lodge, I. O. B. A.; Carlos Greenberg, David A. Ellis, A. W. Burmen, Arthur Williams, Julius Share, the Federation of Jewish Charities, W. M. Werner, the United Benevolent Society, and

J. E. Straus, against the Gardner-Dillingham bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Beatrice H. Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of the Nebraska house of representatives, for a law to tax incomes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. D. Schneider—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Henry R. Klinedinst and Charles Meyers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the trustees of Olive Branch Christian Church, of James City County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of citizens of Maine, for the Littlefield bill against shipping intoxicants into prohibition States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James T. Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of E. J. B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. J. Berryfield et al., of Bradley, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the John B. Stetson Company, for an amendment of the denaturized-alcohol law so as to permit of small distilleries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana: Petition of old soldiers of Indianapolis, Ind., for the service-pension bill as passed by the Senate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of the Mail, Hagerstown, Md., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLARD: Petition of the Nebraska legislature, favoring the enactment of an income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of the legislature of Kansas, for repeal of the duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Wakeeney, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stacey Hoon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Christian Wagner, Elisha B. Foor, Henry Brant, Alexander N. Hart, and John McCune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Barks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of E. R. Symbb & Sons, for legislation governing distillation of alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, for the artillery reorganization bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the International Seaman's Union of America, against the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, against the President's utterances in his message relative to Japanese in said city—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Morris Asinof, against legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National Private Commercial School Managers' Association, for revision of the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the State board of agriculture of Massachusetts, for an appropriation to stay the gypsy and brown-tail moths—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, against the immigration bill now in conference—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of A. Parlett Lloyd, against adoption of the no-fee provision of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, for a pension law in behalf of ex-Union prisoners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of Pennsylvania, for enactment of bill H. R. 4490—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Warren Windham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: Petition of citizens of California, for an amendment of Chinese-exclusion laws to prevent conflict between such laws and our treaty with China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of L. S. Holderman, for legislation providing for reciprocal demurrage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEBBER: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Spring, of Elyria, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 29, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CARTER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

SENATOR FROM KANSAS.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. Charles Curtis, elected by the legislature of Kansas to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator J. R. Burton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the credentials of Charles Curtis, chosen by the legislature of the State of Kansas a Senator from that State for the unexpired term of J. R. Burton, ending March 3, 1907; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. LONG. The Senator-elect is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the Vice-President's desk and take the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. Curtis was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. LONG, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

CHIPPEWA INDIAN LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the Director of the Geological Survey on the drainage survey of lands ceded by the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota which remain unsold and are wet, overflowed, or swampy in character, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers and maps, was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

OHIO RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 23d instant, an indorsement by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, relative to the transmission of the report of the special board authorized under the river and harbor act of 1905 on the Ohio River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLMENT OF POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the Indian appropriation bill for expenses incident to making an enrollment of the Pottawatomie Indians of Wisconsin, under the requirement of the act of June 21, 1906, \$2,500; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 3702. An act for the relief of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 7028. An act for the relief of the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis.;

S. 7147. An act to amend section 2536 of the Revised Statutes, relative to assistant appraisers at the port of New York, and further defining their powers, duties, and compensation;

S. 7827. An act permitting the building of a railway bridge across the Mississippi River in Morrison County, State of Minnesota; and

S. 8014. An act to authorize The National Safe Deposit, Savings and Trust Company of the District of Columbia, to change its name to that of National Savings and Trust Company.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 4267. An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors near the Government Hospital for the Insane and the Home for the Aged and Infirm;

S. 5698. An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia;

S. 6338. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington;"

S. 6470. An act in relation to the Washington Market Company; and

S. 7170. An act to amend an act relating to service on foreign corporations, approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9577) for the relief of Charles H. Stockley.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. R. 86) granting an extension of time to certain homestead entrymen.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 129. An act for the opening of a connecting parkway along Piney Branch between Sixteenth street and Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia;

H. R. 9326. An act for the opening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street;

H. R. 12690. An act to define the term of "registered nurse" and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 14897. An act to protect the streets of the city of Washington;

H. R. 17212. An act to amend an act to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias;

H. R. 21684. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 21, 1906;

H. R. 22350. An act to authorize the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia to recopy old records in his office, and for other purposes;

H. R. 23384. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets;"

H. R. 23830. An act governing the maintenance of stock yards, slaughterhouses, and packing houses in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 23940. An act for the extension of Albemarle street NW., District of Columbia;

H. R. 23941. An act to amend section 14 of the act approved July 29, 1892, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia;"

H. R. 24746. An act for free lectures;

H. R. 24932. An act for the extension of School street NW.;

H. R. 25013. An act granting to the regents of the University of Oklahoma section No. 36, in township No. 9 north, of range No. 3 west, of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla.; and

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to sell certain hay, straw, and grain at Fort Assiniboine. The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 6364) to incorporate the National Child Labor Committee, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, and Mr. SIMS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 6,000 copies of the report of the Postal Commission appointed under the provisions of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department, approved June 26, 1906, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.